

Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (ORNM)  
Washington, D.C. 20235

**Lawrence Park Township  
Comprehensive Plan  
Update**

PREPARED FOR

THE LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS


PREPARED BY

THE LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

-and-

THE ERIE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

September, 1983



**US Department of Commerce  
NOAA Coastal Services Center  
2204 South Hobson Ave.  
Charleston, SC 29405**

4T168.L3L39 1983

## MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

### Lawrence Park Township Board of Commissioners

Mr. James E. Conners, President  
Mr. Raymond M. DePlatchett, Vice President  
Mr. Theodore E. Mohnkern  
Mr. Edward P. Hughes  
Mr. Allen C. Ogden  
Mrs. Dolores M. Bendig, Secretary

### Lawrence Park Township Planning Commission

Mrs. Janis Mahoney, Chairman  
Mr. Charles K. Schnars  
Mr. James Weigle  
Mr. James Conners  
Dr. Thomas Kalkhof  
Mr. Robert Jaskiewicz  
Mr. Jack Shabel  
Mrs. Barbara J. Medwid, Secretary

## CONSULTANT

Erie County Department of Planning

Mr. R. Lawrence Bossolt, ECDP Consultant

The preparation of this report was financed through the Pennsylvania Coastal Zone Management Program under provisions of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, (as amended), administered by the Coastal Zone Management Office, Office of Resources Management, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, and the Erie County Department of Planning.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
BACKGROUND INFORMATION . . . . .	3
DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS . . . . .	7
NEIGHBORHOOD ANALYSIS. . . . .	22
TOWNSHIP FISCAL ANALYSIS . . . . .	30
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES . . . . .	41
LAND USE PLAN. . . . .	45
HOUSING PLAN . . . . .	54
TRANSPORTATION PLAN. . . . .	63
COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN. . . . .	73
IMPLEMENTATION . . . . .	81
APPENDIX A - COASTAL ZONE POLICY FRAMEWORK & SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS . . . . .	A1-A6
APPENDIX B - FEDERAL AND STATE ASSISTANCE. . . . .	B1-B23
APPENDIX C - 1980 CENSUS STATISTICS. . . . .	C1-C14
APPENDIX D - OPINION SURVEY AND RESPONSES. . . . .	D1-D5

## INTRODUCTION

The original comprehensive plan for Lawrence Park Township was completed in the year 1967 by the Erie County Planning Department. The title of the Plan was the Community Improvement Plan. The purpose of this Plan is to analyze the conditions which have been experienced since the last planning program and provide updated planning recommendations where necessary to assist the Township meet its contemporary community development needs. The impetus for this Comprehensive Plan Update came from the Lawrence Park Township Planning Commission. The Planning Commission has been charged with the responsibility of advising the Township Commissioners on future planning needs as well as making recommendations on how to best meet these needs. Prior to reading this Comprehensive Plan Update, the following material is offered to better explain the purpose of planning:

### What is a Comprehensive Plan?

A comprehensive plan is a document that is designed to state basic policies and to guide the future growth and development of the community. It carries no weight of law, but it can assist decision makers. It contains no rules or regulations, but it serves as a basis for any land use provisions enacted by the municipality. It is broad in scope, examining the physical, social and economic characteristics that mesh to make the municipality of today, but it seeks to apply this knowledge to the future. It speaks to various issues in general terms, but it can also make specific recommendations. Basically, the comprehensive plan is, in part, a factual report that examines how the past has led to the present, as well as a report that can be used to chart the community's path into the future.

### What must be included in the Plan?

The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Act 247 of 1968, as amended) mandates that the comprehensive plan contain certain basic elements. These elements are:

- a statement of community development goals and objectives;
- a land use plan;
- a transportation plan;
- a community facilities plan; and
- a statement of the relationship of the community's future development to adjacent areas.

The comprehensive plan is by no means limited to these elements, nor should it be. This Plan, for instance, contains necessary background data and a Housing Plan.

### What are the uses of the Plan?

The comprehensive plan is an official statement setting forth basic policies concerning physical development and social and economic goals. It is typically of a general nature, long-range in its outlook, and considers all factors affecting

growth and development. While its primary function is to serve as a general guide or framework for the future growth and development of a municipality, there is nothing to say that it cannot contain rather specific proposals where it is felt necessary or desirable. As such, the comprehensive plan has several uses:

- policy determination: the plan aids in the consideration and evaluation of alternatives for general, long-range development policies;
- policy effectuation: the plan lends guidance to specific and immediate programs and problems;
- communication: the plan informs individuals of the present and future growth and development policies of the community;
- conveyance of advice to the governing body;
- education: the plan helps everyone who uses it to understand the conditions, problems and opportunities of the community by providing factual information.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### HISTORICAL AND REGIONAL SKETCH

Lawrence Park was established as a village within Millcreek Township in 1911, when the General Electric plant was constructed. The initial street pattern was established in the same year when Smithson, Silliman, and Rankine Avenues were laid out. By 1913 the community was served by city water and sewers and with electricity and telephone service. In 1926 the village was issued a charter establishing the Township of Lawrence Park. Residential development at that time was concentrated between Smithson Avenue and Four Mile Creek, and East Lake Road and Bell Street. Some additional housing was located along Harvey and Halley Avenues north of East Lake Road. This early pattern of development was recognized as one of the first and best examples of community planning in the United States. Since its establishment as a village in 1911, the development of Lawrence Park has paralleled the employment trends at the General Electric plant. During World War I and again during World War II, residential development in the Township was intense, while the Depression in the 1930's saw a drop in development activity. However, in the post World War II era, development in Lawrence Park has tended to be influenced to a greater degree by metropolitan forces rather than by employment fluctuations at the General Electric plant. In the future, metropolitan influences will continue to affect the economic and living environment in Lawrence Park. Therefore, it is important that the Township maintain a continuing and comprehensive planning program that is designed to channel metropolitan influences, as they apply to Lawrence Park, in a direction that will be beneficial to the Township.

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW

Lawrence Park is an industrial-residential suburb. The major industry--General Electric Company--actually sponsored some of the Township's early residential development and the adjacent neighborhoods are still closely allied with the plant as many residents are part of the General Electric Company labor force. The plant is well buffered and separated from adjacent residential areas by parking areas, major roads, parks and open space.

The use of land and functional relationships may be best understood if the community is seen as having four quadrants, each distinctive in use, and each clearly separated from adjacent neighborhoods by major transportation routes or significant natural features. Two of the quadrants are residential, one is industrial, and the fourth is recreational. In addition to these quadrants, a narrow strip of land lying to the south of the railroads and clearly separated from the four quadrants by the railroad is also within the Township boundaries.

The southwestern quadrant is industrial and holds the General Electric manufacturing complex. It is bounded by the major highways separating it from adjacent residential neighborhoods on the northeast and west, and by railroads on the south. Its east-west access is a boulevard which is roughly an extension of Main Street in Lawrence Park, and East Eighth Street from the City of Erie. The boulevard, however, is not open to the public and serves solely for distribution of traffic within the G.E. complex.

Eleven (11) major manufacturing structures are located to the south of the Boulevard so that the heaviest land coverage and most intensive use of land is on the southern portion of the General Electric property adjacent to the railroads. Many of these structures date to World War I and earlier, and on average, are five stories in height. Major parking facilities are located to the east and to the west of this complex. To the north of the Boulevard are several newer manufacturing structures together with service structures, administrative buildings, a water cooling pond, and relative service facilities. Open lawns and administrative and non-manufacturing structures occupy the frontage along East Lake Road. Extensive off-street parking facilities are also located through this area.

Principal access for employees and visitors to the plant is located at the eastern and western terminal of the East-West Boulevard and at the center of the property fronting East Lake Road. The General Electric complex embraces a wide variety of manufacturing operations, many of them independent of one another. Despite such internal diversification, the complex has a functional unification: the major manufacturing structures and operations are clustered in the center and Southern portion of the tract, the service facilities extend northward from these, and the whole is buffered from adjacent properties by peripheral parking lots, open space and administrative structures. Despite its size and large number of employees, it meets high standards of performance and has little adverse effect on adjacent residential areas from noise or pollutants. Major traffic arteries ringing the complex keep heavy industrial traffic away from adjacent residential streets.

The southeast quadrant constitutes the major residential development of Lawrence Park. It is bounded on the West by the General Electric plant, on the south by the railroad, on the north by East Lake Road, and on the west by Harborcreek Township. The development of this area is closely allied with the installation of the General Electric Plant. It was developed in conjunction with the plant to provide housing for employees of the General Electric complex. The western portion of it, lying closest to the General Electric gate, was developed as a cluster plan with town houses and duplexes set on curvilinear streets, with open space and recreational land intertwined with the housing.

The design concept is remarkably similar to, and undoubtedly grew from, the "garden cities" being proposed and developed as satellite communities near London. Having a mixture of Utopian and pragmatic goals, these garden cities were designed so that the inhabitants would have the advantages of nearness to work and to the countryside, inhabit good houses with gardens, enjoy healthy and pleasant environments and modern, urban services. This garden city movement was first manifested in the development of the town of Welwyn, twenty miles outside of London by Sir Ebenezer Howard, and further developed in the suburb of Letchworth in 1919.

The first section of Lawrence Park to be developed just prior to World War I incorporated the most advanced thinking of the time. It continues to this day to be a stable, inviting and pleasant residential environment. Design features which are similar to the British garden city designs include: the continuation of the main axis of the General Electric plant through the residential community (Main Street); a wide boulevard (Iroquois Avenue) converging at an angle with the main axial street (Main Street); the contrast of these formal axes by the

introduction of a curvilinear, informally designed, peripheral street system (Napier and Emmet Drive); the establishment of park lands around the periphery and extending into the residential area located along Four Mile Creek and extending from both Napier and Emmet Drive; the establishment of a small business area in the center of the residential community; and the placing of garden houses--or town houses--so as to enhance the mixture of formality and informality. All of these factors are notable since it is most unusual in the United States to see residential development follow a comprehensive design which integrates major thoroughfares, residential streets, open space, parks and structures. Indeed, following the initial surge of development, subsequent building followed the more haphazard pattern that is more typical of residential development in this country. The business area is located in the center of this quadrant. North of Iroquois Avenue and west of Rankine Avenue single-family homes predominate. Major school tracts are also located in this quadrant together with light manufacturing uses at the edges of the quadrant.

The northwestern quadrant lying to the north of East Lake Road is a second major residential neighborhood comprised almost entirely of single-family dwellings. Most of these have been developed during the major suburban growth era following World War II, although a few older houses and some commercial uses are located along the western frontage of East Lake Road. This area comprises a total of 385 housing units with a municipal park extending south from the lakefront through the center of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is bounded by Lake Erie on the north, East Lake Road on the south, Lawrence Park Golf Club on the east, and a wooded tract on the west.

Another quadrant occupies the northeast corner of the Township and is comprised of the Lawrence Park Golf Club. A small motel and a number of single-family homes are located in this quadrant on the frontage of East Lake Road. Four Mile Creek traverses the center of this quadrant and the General Electric Fishing Club is located near the point where Four Mile Creek enters Lake Erie.

A final portion of the Township is a strip lying south of the railroad. This strip, accessible only through Harborcreek Township, lies behind the commercial frontage on Buffalo Road and is presently utilized for light industrial uses and for a mobile home park. It should be noted that an error on the U.S. Census tracts in 1970 placed this parcel of land in Harborcreek Township so that the residents of the mobile home park were not counted as residents of Lawrence Park Township.

#### PHYSIOGRAPHY

Lawrence Park is located on a relatively flat lake plain along the shores of Lake Erie. The area south of East Lake Road (Pa.5) is flat with the exception of a minor depression (swale) in the vicinity of the railroad right-of-way. North of East Lake Road, the land has a gentle downward slope to the shores of Lake Erie. However, there is an escarpment at the waters edge which creates a bluff, approximately twenty to forty feet in height. The bluff is interrupted at three points where Four Mile Creek, and two minor streams flow into the lake forming small beach areas. The only other major physical feature in the Township is the small valley created by Four Mile Creek.

The subsurface conditions in the Township do not present any impediment to urban growth. However, subsurface drainage of building sites is required in some areas of the Township due to seasonally high water tables. The only major impediment to urban development of the Township can be found along the Four Mile Creek valley where certain areas are subject to flooding in periods of storm water runoff. The physical conditions in the Township are depicted on the accompanying map.

This is a detailed street map of the Fourmile Creek area. The map shows a grid of streets, including Franklin Ave at the top, Lawrence Parkway running horizontally across the middle, and several vertical streets like Putnam St, Rankine St, and Sillman St. A dashed line runs diagonally from the top left towards the bottom right, separating the Fourmile Creek area from the Five Mile Creek area. To the right of the map is Lake Erie. A golf course, Lawrence Park Golf Course, is located between the Fourmile Creek and Five Mile Creek areas. Various other streets are labeled, such as Malley Ave, Putnam Dr, Lasalle Ave, and Crotty Dr. The map also shows some parks and green spaces, including Fourmile Creek and Lawrence Park.

**3303 COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**



## DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

### INTRODUCTION

An understanding of the population of a community and its various characteristics is an essential element of any comprehensive plan. In order to develop plans and policies for the future of the Township, it is necessary to have an understanding of the characteristics of its population, past, present, and future. Based upon a population or demographic analysis, the quantity and quality of future township services and location of public facilities can be determined in a logical manner. The data in this section should also be helpful as an information source which the Township may need for the preparation of funding applications to the State and Federal governments.

### POPULATION TRENDS

Lawrence Park's population has increased slightly but steadily each decade during the past fifty (50) years with exception only to the 1930-1940 period. The steady increase is fairly significant when one considers the fact that the Township has minimal land area available for new subdivision growth. The following table traces and compares the census results of Lawrence Park with Erie County during the 1930-1980 period:

Table 1

#### Population Trends 1930-1980

	<u>1930</u>	<u>1940</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>
<u>Lawrence Park</u>						
Population	3,241	3,120	4,154	4,403	4,517	4,584
Change in #	N.A.	-121	1,034	249	114	67
Change in %	N.A.	-3.7	33.1	6.0	2.6	1.5
<u>Erie County</u>						
Population	175,277	180,889	219,388	250,682	263,654	279,780
Change in #	21,741	5,612	38,499	31,294	12,972	16,126
Change in %	14.2	3.2	21.3	14.3	5.2	6.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1980 and Erie County Population Analysis, 1972.

During the 1930-1980 period, an overall percentage gain of 41% was experienced by the Township; however, in terms of raw numbers the increase stood at only 1,343. The growth experience of Erie County for the same period of time was 60%.

In terms of County population rank, the 1980 Census results placed Lawrence Park Township in the number nine (9) position among the County's 39 incorporated municipalities. The eight (8) municipalities ahead of Lawrence Park were: the City of Erie (119,123), Millcreek Township (44,303), Harborcreek Township (14,644), Fairview Township (7,518), City of Corry (7,149), Edinboro (6,324), North East Township (5,750), and Summit Township (5,381). Even though several of Erie County's municipalities experienced higher growth rates during the 1970-80 period, Lawrence Park Township's rate should be interpreted as positive and a sign of stabilized growth. The immediate regional growth situation which Lawrence Park is within is depicted on the following table:

Table 2

Comparative Population Growth 1930-1980

	<u>1930</u>	<u>1940</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>
Lawrence Park	3,241	3,120	4,154	4,403	4,517	4,584
Wesleyville	2,854	2,918	4,411	3,534	3,920	3,998
Harborcreek	2,890	3,602	7,474	10,569	12,038	14,644
Millcreek	4,865	7,444	17,037	28,441	36,946	44,303
Erie County	175,277	180,889	219,388	250,682	263,654	279,780
Erie City	115,967	116,955	130,803	138,440	129,231	119,123
Pennsylvania	9,631,000	9,900,000	10,498,000	11,319,000	11,794,000	11,863,895
United States	123,203,000	132,165,000	151,326,000	179,323,000	203,302,020	226,545,805
Lawrence Park as a percentage of Erie County	1,849%	1.725%	1.893%	1.756%	1.713%	1.638%

Source: U.S. Census

It is interesting to note that Lawrence Park Township's most recent 10 year growth rate of 1.5% outpaced that of both the State and the nation (1.1%); however, it lagged behind Erie County's (6.1%). Nearby townships (e.g. Harborcreek and Millcreek) have grown at a more rapid pace due to the availability of land and the continued county trend of suburban attraction.

Lawrence Park's nominal population growth during the past few decades has been attributable to two (2) key factors: (1) limited available land resources and (2) a decreasing average household size. Following is a brief discussion of each of these factors.

The increase in Lawrence Park's population during the last two decades has been a result of construction of single-family homes and the conversion of older row homes into multi-unit structures. Relatively few vacant parcels of ground remain (with the exception of the golf course) which are suitable for new residential construction. A reduced rate of construction during the 1980's is already a reality and this is a direct result of the reduced availability of land.

The second factor affecting growth is the reduction in the average size of the household. Throughout the Nation's history, there has been a continuing decrease in the average population per household. Historical records of the Census Bureau indicate that the average population per household has continually decreased from 5.79 persons per household in 1790 to 5.55 in 1850; 4.76 in 1900; 3.52 in 1950; 3.21 in 1970; and 2.73 in 1980. This trend is only partly attributable to changes in the birth rate and in the average number of children born to each family. A second and more critical factor reflected in these trends is the undoubling of families. Today, the typical family is a nuclear family, comprised only of parents and dependent children; as opposed to the extended family which prevailed throughout most of this Nation's history. The extended family included three or more generations and may well have included brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, and cousins. The undoubling of the family has resulted in a substantial increase in the one or two person family, greatly reducing the average population per household. Within Lawrence Park, the average population per household has remained slightly higher than national averages, standing at 4.92 in 1950; 3.90 in 1960; 3.27 in 1970; and 2.82 in 1980.

The net effect of the decline in the population per household unit would be a decrease in population even though the same number of families and households remained in the community. In the same way, it will result in the reduced rate of growth even where new units are being added. Since 1970, for example, the number of dwelling units has increased by about 22%, but the population has increased by only 2% in the Township.

#### POPULATION COMPOSITION - AGE/SEX

The 1980 Census included a precise breakdown on the population composition of the Township. The following table includes the complete figures for all males and females by age via the most recent Census:

Table 3

Lawrence Park Township  
Age/Sex Composition  
1980

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Under one year	27	28	55
1 and 2 years	57	60	117
3 and 4 years	52	59	111
5 years	24	27	51
6 years	35	30	65
7 to 9 years	109	93	202
10 to 13 years	148	151	299
14 years	46	46	92
15 years	47	43	90
16 years	36	48	84
17 years	44	54	98
18 years	44	37	81
19 years	33	36	69
20 years	31	43	74
21 years	38	42	80
22 to 24 years	107	100	207
25 to 29 years	157	163	320
30 to 34 years	133	124	257
35 to 44 years	193	237	430
45 to 54 years	255	288	543
55 to 59 years	161	186	347
60 and 61 years	66	64	130
62 to 64 years	72	95	167
65 to 74 years	158	197	355
75 to 84 years	73	116	189
85 years and over	<u>18</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>71</u>
Totals	2,164	2,420	4,584

---

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1980.

---

The median age of all persons within the Township stood at 33.8 years in 1980; 36.1 years for all females and 31.8 years for all males. By comparison, Erie County's median age figures for the year 1980 indicate that a slightly younger population exists on the countywide level; i.e. the total County median age stood at 29.2 years with the female median age at 30.4 years and the male median age at 28.1 years. Median age is not the average age, it is the mid-point at which half of the population falls above and half below.

The following table compares the 1980 and 1970 Age/Sex Population Groups of the Township. Data to the degree generated by the 1980 Census were not available via the 1970 Census, and as such, the 1980 data were assembled to match the available 1970 output. While the groups are broader, meaningful comparisons and future implications can still be drawn.

Table 4  
Population by Age & Sex Group  
Lawrence Park Township 1970 & 1980

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>% Male</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>% Female</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>Total %</u> <u>of 1970 Pop.</u>
0-4	173	8.2	185	7.7	358	7.9
5-14	474	22.3	519	21.7	993	22.0
15-24	328	15.5	357	14.9	685	15.2
25-34	199	9.4	212	8.8	411	9.1
35-44	277	13.1	322	13.4	599	13.3
45-54	297	14.0	311	13.0	608	13.5
55-64	208	9.8	229	9.6	437	9.6
65+	<u>165</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>261</u>	<u>10.9</u>	<u>426</u>	<u>9.4</u>
Total	2,121	100.0	2,396	100.0	4,517	100.0

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>% Male</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>% Female</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>Total %</u> <u>of 1980 Pop.</u>
0-4	136	6.3	147	6.1	283	6.2
5-14	362	16.7	347	14.3	709	15.5
15-24	380	17.6	403	16.7	783	17.1
25-34	290	13.4	287	11.9	577	12.6
35-44	193	8.9	237	9.8	430	9.4
45-54	255	11.8	288	11.9	543	11.8
55-64	299	13.8	345	14.3	644	14.0
65+	<u>249</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>366</u>	<u>15.1</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>13.4</u>
Total	2,164	100.0	2,420	100.0	4,584	100.0

While endless conjecture and comparisons can be drawn from an analysis of the precluding tables, several general but pertinent characteristics concerning the recent changes and future implications of the Township's population composition stand out and are summarized herein. The reader should also observe Table 5 for a better understanding of the following summary.

- The very young population of the Township (0-4 years) has dropped off considerably (down 21%) during 1970-80. There were 75 fewer children in this age group in 1980. This is an obvious parallel to the national lower birth rate experience.

- The key school-age group (5-14 years) has dropped at an alarming rate. There were 284 less children within this age group in 1980.
- Together, the 14 years and under group constituted close to 30% of the Township's 1970 population, while in 1980 this group only accounted for about 22% of this total. This trend has already affected the school system, as low enrollment figures have been experienced.
- The Township is also losing much of its young adult population as is indicated in the 1970 age "5-14" and 1980 age "15-24" age group experience. Of the 993 youths aged 5-14 in 1970, the 1980 "15-24" age group totaled only 783. The significance of a 210 person reduction gives evidence that the young are leaving the community. Most often this move is necessitated by employment and/or education needs. Fortunately for the Township, the "15-24" age group contained close to 100 more young citizens in 1980 than it did in 1970. This second fact shows that in-migration is counteracting the experienced out-migration in these age groups during the 1970-80 period.
- The "25-34" age group experience was similar to the previous explanation; however, it was not as extreme. A decline of 108 persons was experienced from the "15-24" age group total of 685 persons in 1970; however, overall the "25-34" age group grew by 166 persons. This positive net gain is a healthy sign for the Township as this group is an important child bearing and income producing segment of the population.
- The second highest age group loss occurred in the age 35-44 group. Numerically, there was a 169 person loss in this age group, and the loss was apparently self-contained within this group as there was actually a small step increase in the "25-34" age group during the 1970-80 period. The loss of this age group was the most devastating blow to the Township's overall population total in 1980, as the decline in the "0-4" and "5-14" age groups were also directly affected by the movement of the parent "35-44" age group. An additional loss in the "45-54" age group, while not as extreme, was also experienced.
- The fact that Lawrence Park is retaining its older population is indisputable. Due to the solid residential atmosphere of the community, increased longevity, the existence of specialized elderly care in the Township as well as individual economic realities and desires, Lawrence Park has significantly increased its "55-64" and "65+" age groups. In terms of percentages, the "55-64" age group constituted 9.6% in 1970 and in the most recent census this grew to 14.0%. Likewise, the 65+ senior citizen group which constituted 9.4% of the 1970 total population grew to 13.4% of the 1980 total population. This rate exceeded that of the overall County's, which in 1980 registered 10.9%. Inasmuch as these age groups, especially the 65+ group, is the least mobile of all the Township's population, new service demands for elderly care and housing will be placed upon the Township.

Table 5

Lawrence Park Township Age Group Comparisons  
1970 - 1980

<u>Ten Year Age Group</u> <u>Step Experience</u>				<u>Ten Year Age Group</u> <u>Numerical Comparison</u>			
<u>Age Group</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Age Group</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>Change</u>
0-4	358	283	N.A.	0-4	358	283=	-75
5-14	993	709	N.A.	5-14	993	709=	-284
15-24	685	783=	-210	15-24	685	783=	98
25-34	411	577=	-108	25-34	411	577=	166
35-44	599	430=	29	35-44	599	430=	-169
45-54	608	543=	-56	45-54	608	543=	-65
55-64	437	644=	36	55-64	437	644=	207
65+	426	615=	178	65+	426	615=	189
Totals	4,517	4,584=	N.A.	Totals	4,517	4,584=	67

Source: 1970 and 1980 Census and Consultant's calculations.

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

This section provides selected characteristics of the Township's 1980 population as was recorded by the Census. Much of the following data will be more important for potential use in applying for state and Federal assistance than it is for planning purposes. Material from the 1970 Census is used as a comparison where pertinent. Township officials should obtain a copy of the entire 1980 Census information data for future grantsmanship needs. The County Department of Planning has been designated as a local statistical data center and is in possession of all 1980 Census data.

Race

Statistics from the 1980 Census indicate that the total 1980 population of 4,584 was racially composed of 4,561 whites, three (3) blacks, four (4) American Indians, two (2) Japanese, five (5) Chinese, five (5) Korean, one (1) Asian Indian and three (3) other. Lawrence Park's population was, therefore, composed of a 99.5% white population. This figure is higher than the total County percentage of whites, which stood at 94.7% in 1980. An additional 14 persons of Spanish origin were also enumerated via the 1980 Census.

### Families

In 1980, there were 1,237 families in the Township. This total was up by 51 from the 1970 Census count of 1,186. Families, according to the Census, do not necessarily imply that children are present. The average number of persons per family for Lawrence Park was 3.28, slightly lower than the 3.34 family size of the County for the Census year 1980.

### Households

The term household, as defined by the Census, equals the number of occupied housing units. Statistics on households are generally important parameters for various housing and community service grant programs of the state and Federal government. In 1980, there were 1,588 households recorded within the Township. Of this total, 100 persons resided in group quarters, 92 of which were 65 years and over. A total of 197 senior citizens (65+) were single householders; 114 seniors formed husband-wife households; forty (40) seniors lived with other relatives; two (2) seniors lived with nonrelative/family type households; and 170 seniors lived in nonfamily households.

### Persons Per Household

The average number of persons per occupied housing unit was 2.82 in 1980, down considerably from the 3.27 average established for the Township by the 1970 Census. The trend of a decreasing household size has been experienced in many other Erie County communities in recent years. Overall, Erie County's 1980 household size nearly matched that of the Township's at 2.81 persons. The declining birth rate is a primary reason for this reduction; this is not merely a localized trend, it is a nationwide experience. Persons per dwelling unit is commonly used as a multiplier (times housing units) to determine the population base of various service areas within the community.

### Owner/Rental Housing

Of the total 1980 household population, the Census revealed that 667 persons are housed in the rental market. The Census also revealed that there are 259 housing units that are renter occupied. The median contract rent for these units stood at \$175.00 per month, slightly above the overall County median of \$161.00. The amount of owner occupied housing units recorded for 1980 was 1,329. It is important to note that owner occupied housing excludes the following: units at an address with two or more units, units on 10 or more acres, units with a commercial establishment on the property, and mobile homes and trailers. The median value of the Township occupied housing units was recorded at \$38,900, slightly below the County and State median values of \$39,700 and \$39,100 respectively.

### Income

The mean or average family income of Lawrence Park Township increased by 111.6% during the 1970-80 period. This rapid rise is consistent with that experienced at the County, State and national levels. The 1980 Census tabulated the mean family income of Lawrence Park at \$22,552 (up \$11,894 from the 1970 Census recorded mean family income of \$10,658). The median family income was also up

sharply for the Township and its 1980 rate of \$19,868 was slightly above that of Erie County's (\$19,804). However, it was slightly below that of the State (\$19,995) and nation (\$19,908).

The median and mean household income (household income is determined by all persons living in a housing unit regardless of family status) of Lawrence Park in 1980 stood at \$18,783 and \$20,526 respectively. Both of these figures surpassed those of Erie County (\$16,760 median and \$19,040 mean).

Following is a table that illustrates the complete household and family income experience of the Township:

Table 6  
Lawrence Park Township  
Income - 1980

<u>Range of Income</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>Families</u>
Less than \$2,500	9	9
\$2,500 to \$4,999	52	6
\$5,000 to \$7,499	157	67
\$7,500 to \$9,999	108	61
\$10,000 to \$12,499	139	103
\$12,500 to \$14,999	120	105
\$15,000 to \$17,499	102	84
\$17,500 to \$19,999	228	208
\$20,000 to \$22,499	72	63
\$22,500 to \$24,999	94	90
\$25,000 to \$27,499	86	72
\$27,500 to \$29,999	127	105
\$30,000 to \$34,999	139	128
\$35,000 to \$39,999	52	46
\$40,000 to \$49,999	87	81
\$50,000 to \$74,999	36	36
\$75,000 or more		
MEDIAN	18,783	19,868
MEAN	20,526	22,552

---

Source: 1980 Census.

---

### Poverty

A total of 229 persons in the Township were recorded by the 1980 Census as living in poverty status (according to Federal poverty guidelines). The overall percentage of poverty was, however, a low one as only 4.99% of the total Township population fell into this category. The rate of poverty is much higher at the Erie County level at 9.76% (27,326 poverty residents divided by 279,780 total residents).

The 1980 Census also provided some evidence as to the age groupings of poverty level residents. Of the 229 poverty population, 184 were under 55 years of age, 14 were aged 55 to 59, and 31 were 65 years and over. It should be noted that an additional 100 elderly persons were tabulated by the 1980 Census as being residents within group/institutional quarters. This latter group is not, however, necessarily of poverty level status.

### Education

Lawrence Park Township's population contains 822 persons 18 years old and over that do not possess at least a high school education. This figure translates to a 24.6% rate. The remaining 75.4% of the Township's 18 years old and over age group (2,516 persons) have completed four (4) years of high school at a minimum. Finally, 819 persons, or 24.5% of all 18 years old and over residents within the Township have completed one or more years of college.

In comparison, 27.9% of Erie County's total 18 years old and over population, lacked a high school degree, while the remaining 72.1% completed four (4) years of high school; 25.5% of Erie County's 18 years old and over population completed one or more years of college. These percentages were also calculated via 1980 Census raw data.

### Employment and Labor Force

According to the 1980 Census definition of civilian labor force, there were 1,921 persons aged 16 years and over that constituted the employed labor force. Of this amount, there were 1,102 males (57.4%) and 819 females (42.6%). In addition, a total of 160 persons were unemployed (105 male and 55 female) and 1,437 persons aged 16 years and over were not in the labor force due to various reasons (1,011 females and 426 males).

Of those persons 16 years and older that were employed, 18.8% (361 persons) held administrative support positions; 15.3% (293 persons) held occupations in assembly, machine operation or inspectors; 13.8% (266 persons) were employed via the precision production, craft and repair occupations; 13.2% (254 persons) were of the special professional occupational group; 11.1% (214 persons) were employed in the service occupations; 8.9% (172 persons) were employed in sales occupations; 7.9% (153 persons) were employed in managerial and special professional occupations; 3.7% (71 persons) were employed in technical and related support occupations; 3.2% (61 persons) were employed in general labor occupations; 2.9% (55 persons) were employed in the transportation and material moving occupation group; and .8% (16 persons) were employed in the protective service group; and, a very small .2% (5 persons) were employed via the farming, forestry, and fishing occupations.

In comparison to overall Erie County 1980 Census statistics, it is interesting to note that percentage wise, the number of persons employed in manufacturing industries is much larger in Lawrence Park, i.e. 48.1% (924 persons) of the Township's total employed labor force (1,921 persons) held their jobs in manufacturing as compared to the 36.1% County rate. The following Table gives comparative data for the Township and overall County:

Table 7

Employed Persons (16 Years and Over)  
By Industry: Lawrence Park and Erie County  
1980

<u>Industry</u>	<u>Lawrence Park</u>		<u>Erie County</u>
	<u>Persons</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Mining	0	-	1.8
Construction	36	1.9	3.7
Manufacturing:			
Nondurable Goods	192	10.0	8.6
Durable Goods	732	38.1	27.5
Transportation	51	2.7	3.0
Communication, Other Public Utilities	46	2.4	3.0
Wholesale Trade	42	2.2	3.0
Retail Trade	263	13.7	16.0
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	95	5.0	4.6
Business and Repair Services	47	2.4	3.2
Personal, Entertainment, and Recreation Services	41	2.1	3.0
Professional and Related Services:			
Health Services	109	5.7	8.1
Educational Services	176	9.2	7.9
Other Professional and Related Services	39	2.0	3.7
Public Administration	<u>52</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.0</u>
Totals	1,921	100.0	100.0

Note: Percentages may not add due to rounding.

Source: 1980 Census and calculations therefrom.

Finally, out of the 1,921 persons that constituted the employed labor force in 1980, 87% (1,672 persons) received wages and salaries from private sources; 11.0% (216 persons) received their wages from working in government (Federal, State and local); and 2% (33 persons) received their earnings via self-employment. These percentages closely parallel those of Erie County.

#### POPULATION PROJECTIONS

The projection of future population is traditionally included in comprehensive planning efforts to determine the general extent and need for future community facilities and services. There are numerous different methods which can be used to calculate future population. Some methods are simple, while others are extremely complicated. All, however, provide estimates which are based upon a knowledge of past trends and anticipated future events. Projections of future population, therefore, should be taken with the proverbial "grain of salt," for they are only as reliable as the assumptions on which they are based. Parameters that obviously affect future population size include migration, family size, economic conditions, availability of public water and sewer as well as the overall amenities and land availability of a community to attract and house future population.

As mentioned earlier in this section, the two (2) major factors which will limit future population growth in the Township are the decreasing size of the household and the minimal amount of land available for new development in the Township. In order to give one an example of the effect that these two factors alone would have on the future population growth of the Township, population holding capacities have been developed in the following table. Various growth figures have been developed as a result of using the Township's remaining land area, household size (1980) and various density standards. Please note that the acreage possibilities are laid out to accommodate the potential of full development (260 acres), golf course development only (200 acres), development of nearly all buildable residential lots outside of the golf course (60 acres), or a small amount of development (25 acres).

Table 8  
Lawrence Park Township  
Land Area Holding Capacities

<u>1980 Population</u>	<u>Additional Acreage Available</u>	<u>Additional Potential Housing Units</u>	<u>Average Household Size</u>	<u>Additional Population With Development</u>	<u>Total Population Holding Capacity</u>
4,584	25(A)	156	2.82	439	5,023
4,584	60(A)	373	2.82	1,052	5,636
4,584	200(A)	1,245	2.82	3,510	8,094
4,584	260(A)	1,618	2.82	4,563	9,147
4,584	25(B)	109	2.82	307	4,891
4,584	60(B)	261	2.82	736	5,320
4,584	200(B)	870	2.82	2,453	7,037
4,584	260(B)	1,131	2.82	3,189	7,773
4,584	200(C)	1,742	2.82	4,912	9,496
4,584	200(C)+60(A)	2,115	2.82	5,964	10,548
4,584	200(C)+60(B)	2,003	2.82	5,648	10,232

Note: Factors Used:

Minimum Lot Size

(A) 7,000 sq. ft. lot size or  
(B) 10,000 sq. ft. lot size or  
(C) 5,000 sq. ft. lot size or

Housing Density

6.22 units per acre  
4.35 units per acre  
8.71 units per acre

Source: Consultant's calculations.

As can be observed, an ultimate population of 10,548 persons was the output of the holding capacity analysis. This figure is based upon the assumption that the Lawrence Park Golf Course will be fully developed at a maximum of 8.71 units per acre (approximately 200 acres) and that a remaining 60 acres of open land within the Township would be developed at a density of 6.22 units per acre in line with the current most liberal minimum lot size (7,000 sq. ft.) permitted via zoning. The size of the household and base population have been held to the 1980 Census experience within all holding capacity calculations.

Obviously, these figures are not realistic for planning purposes; they do, however, offer maximum levels that must be tolerated by any projection methodology. A review of population projections that have been made for the Township in the past reveals that all projections have been within the 10,548 person holding capacity of the Township. The following chart compares past projections that have been made for the Township:

Table 9

Past Population Projections  
Lawrence Park Township

<u>Source</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2010</u>
Community Improvements Plan - Lawrence Park Township - 1967	4,825*	5,239*	5,271*	-	-
Erie County Population Analysis - 1972	-	4,632*	4,682*	4,731*	
Comp. Plan - Beckman Associates - 1980	-	4,800*	4,800*	4,900*	5,000*
Actual Census Counts	4,517	4,584	-	-	-

---

\* Projected figures.

---

Of the above, the projections contained within the Erie County Population Analysis (completed by the Erie County Metropolitan Planning Department in 1972) have proven to be closest to the Census year 1980. Compared to the official 1980 Census count of 4,584 persons, the projection offered by the County Planning Office was off by a mere 48 persons, or one (1) percent. The projection methodology used by the County was the Cohort-Survival method. Simply stated, this method involves the use of existing birth and death rates for the various age-sex (cohort) groups and a determined survival rate which is factored progressively into the future. The Cohort-Survival technique was based, however, upon the County as a whole. After the County projections were developed, regional and sub-regional (municipal) allocations were made based upon various growth assumptions. For Lawrence Park Township, the authors obviously built in a slow but progressive growth factor, which was correct.

Due to the fact that the County projections are well within acceptable deviation of the 1980 Census results, and the 1980-2000 projected figures translate to a 3.2% rate of growth which is a reasonable extension of the rate of increase experienced by the Township during the past two (2) decades (4.1%), the population projections of the Erie County Population Analysis are still viable for planning purposes in Lawrence Park. As development of the Lawrence Park Golf Course is not anticipated, the population capacity identified in Table 9 is also recommended as a maximum growth figure for the purposes of the Plan Update. The following table adapts and extends the County Population Analysis projections by five (5) year increments to the year 2000.

Table 10

Lawrence Park Township Recommended  
Comprehensive Plan Population Projections

<u>1980</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>
4,584	4,632	4,682	4,702	4,731

---

Source: Erie County Population Analysis, Erie County  
Metropolitan Department.

---

# NEIGHBORHOOD ANALYSIS

The first Neighborhood Analysis was developed in the 1967 Community Improvement Plan of the Township. The 1967 Plan identified six neighborhood units for the purpose of statistical analysis and the primary source of information was a field survey. In order to continue the documentation of neighborhood planning indicators, the 1980 Bureau of Census and a 1983 field survey were used to provide current insight. Due to the fact that the 1980 Census enumeration provided statistical information on population and housing on a block-by-block basis, the same boundaries utilized in the 1967 Plan were used and are shown on the accompanying map. Comparative population and dwelling unit counts are made with the 1970 Census in Table 11 and land use and density figures are detailed in Table 12.

Table 11

## Lawrence Park Township Selected Neighborhood Analysis Data Concerning Population and Housing 1970-80

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>Total</u>
Population 1980	1,190	1	1,203	754	1,238	198	4,584
Population 1970 <sup>a</sup>	1,429	2	1,015	714	1,370	117	4,634
1970-80 Change	-239	-1	188	40	-132	81	-50
Total Dwelling Units - 1980	410	1	448	267	408	93	1,627
Single Family	401	1	427	243	379	20	1,471
2-9 Units	9	0	19	24	27	1	80
10+ Units	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0	1	72	73
Occupied Rental	18	0	46	79	101	13	257
% of All Units Renter Occupied	4.39%	-	10.26%	29.58%	24.75%	13.97%	15.79%
Persons Per Unit	2.90	-	2.68	2.82	3.03 (2.79) <sup>b</sup>	2.12	2.82
Total Dwelling Units - 1970 <sup>a</sup>	388	1	328	246	401	51	1,415
1970-80 Dwelling Units Change	22	-	120	21	7	42	212

(See next page for footnotes)

- a The 1970 Census total as adjusted to correct errors in tabulation in Neighborhood Areas 4 and 6.
- b The figures in parenthesis represent the household size when the 100 residents of the Twinbrook Nursing Home are deducted from the population.

Source: Consultant's calculations from the 1980 Census of Population and Housing Block Statistics for Lawrence Park Township and 1970 Census material.

Table 12  
Lawrence Park Township  
Neighborhood Density and Land Use Data

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>Total</u>
Residential	95	1	83	25	31	11	246
Commercial	2	0	3	8	2	0	15
Industrial	0	0	0	3	4	365	372
Public & Institutional	11	203	18	21	32	0	285
Streets R-O-W's	25	3	33	7	18	11	97
Vacant	<u>32</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>163</u>
Total Acres	165	207	168	64	97	477	1,178
1980 Gross Density <sup>a</sup>	7.2	-	7.1	11.8	12.8	.42	3.89
1970 Gross Density <sup>a</sup>	8.6	-	6.0	11.2	14.1	.25	3.93
1980 Net Density <sup>b</sup>	12.5	-	14.5	30.2	39.9	18.0	18.63
1980 Housing Density <sup>c</sup>	4.3	-	5.4	10.7	13.1	8.5	6.61
1970 Housing Density <sup>c</sup>	4.0	-	4.0	9.8	12.9	4.6	5.75

<sup>a</sup> Gross Density is the number of people per total acreage.

<sup>b</sup> Net Density is the number of people per residential acre.

<sup>c</sup> Housing Density is the number of dwelling units per residential acre.

Source: Densities calculated by consultant. Land Use figures via Beckman and Associates, 1980.

Neighborhood Analysis Unit Number One (1) is bounded by East Lake Road (and the G.E. grounds) on the south, the Lawrence Park Golf Course on the east, the City of Erie on the west and the Lake on the north. In terms of population size, this area places third to neighborhood area numbers five (5) and six (6). During the 1970-80 period, this neighborhood lost 239 persons which resulted in a 16.7% loss in total population. This represented the largest neighborhood population decline in the Township. Housing units have, however, slightly increased by 22 units. The reason for this loss is, therefore, tied to the previously described lower family size trend.

Neighborhood Area One (1) is composed predominantly of post World War II housing and its overall quality is rated as excellent. The neighborhood is fortunate to have two (2) quality park areas within easy walking distance of all parts of the neighborhood. The few commercial uses that do exist are located along Route 5. These uses are not neighborhood oriented and are located on Route 5 as a result of its arterial location attraction to motorists.

No mixed land use problems were identified within the neighborhood and overall it has to be regarded as the most stable residential area in the Township. Zoning in the form of single family predominates and should be continued. No further commercial development along E. Lake Road past Joliette Avenue should be permitted as traffic movement is already a burden to access and egress from this residential area. Future growth will be limited to the vacant land which lies north of McDonalds and the Church property along the City line. The extension of Lakeside Drive and Cabot Avenue into this area should be considered as well as connection to the City of Erie street system in the future design of the potential subdivision. Single family housing at existing density levels would represent the best use of this area, should this open land become marketable. An exception that should be considered would be use of the land as an elderly housing site.

Neighborhood Analysis Unit Number Two (2) is bounded by East Lake Road, Harborcreek Township, Neighborhood #1 and the Lake. The Lawrence Park Golf Course is the predominating use in this area, and next to the General Electric Company, the Golf Course is the major regional attraction within the Township. Its continued use as a golf course will provide the Township with protection of the Four Mile Creek Corridor from Lake Erie to Route 5, in addition to providing a natural focal point for the capture of retail trade. While the goal of conservation should be primary, future economic realities may necessitate a reuse of the property. Considering the location and physiography of the land, the only acceptable development option which should be considered would be residential. While this should not be encouraged, a carefully developed planned residential development ordinance should be maintained that could be used as a discussion document between potential developers and the Township. Use of cluster development approaches with mandatory open space and easement standards should be built into the ordinance so that future designs are compatible with the existing overall medium development density of the Township and so that the Four Mile Creek and coastal areas are fully preserved. Again, however, maintenance of this area as a conservation district should be a long-term objective of the Township.

Neighborhood Analysis Unit Number Three (3) is bounded by East Lake Road, the Golf Course, Iroquois Avenue, and Nagle Road on the Harborcreek Township line. This particular neighborhood is mainly constituted of older, pre-World War II single family and row-type housing on small lots. Overall, even though the housing is older, the neighborhood is very well maintained and the quality of housing is rated as excellent.

Population within neighborhood three (3) has increased by 188 persons or 18.5% during the 1970-80 decade, due largely to new single family construction in the eastern portion of the neighborhood. According to Census data, there was a 30% increase (99 units) in dwelling units experienced during the past decade.

While about 90% of the housing within neighborhood three (3) is owner occupied, 17.9% of the entire Township's rental housing market is located in the neighborhood. Both population and housing density, however, are still at medium levels and internal density (persons per dwelling unit) is under the Township average.

The predominant zoning of the neighborhood is and should continue to be R-1 single family. Public use zoning is also concentrated within this neighborhood to protect Township and school district lands and facilities. The rental housing is fairly well contained within an R-2 residential district located south of Elbow Tree Park to Iroquois Avenue and from Rankine Avenue to the school district property east of Smithson Street. Further pressures for single to two family conversions, in some of the older and larger homes, could well be expected in areas adjacent to the R-2 District.

Neighborhood three (3) also contains limited and specialized commercial and public service establishments along Iroquois Avenue, e.g. the State Police Barracks, a funeral home, and medical center. Future plans for the reuse of the Lawrence Park Primary School as an extended elderly care facility and a possible new regional criminal laboratory being constructed on the State Police property are currently being considered. Also, in proximity to the residential neighborhood is the Lawrence Park Branch of the County Library. All considered, there are no blighting influences in Neighborhood three (3).

Neighborhood Analysis Unit Number Four (4) is a triangular area cordoned off by Iroquois Avenue, Main Street and Lawrence Parkway. This neighborhood has also witnessed a slight population increase (40 persons or 5.6% increase) during the past ten (10) years. Next to Neighborhood five (5), Neighborhood four (4) has the second highest amount of rental occupied units (79), and overall 30.7% of the Township's 257 rental units are found in this neighborhood. Most, if not all, of the 21 dwelling unit increase established by Neighborhood four (4) during the 1970-80 period was caused as a result of residential conversions. Much of the area, from Napier Avenue through Priestly Avenue, has been zoned as R-2 which accommodates two (2) family and multi-family conversions. This has created the second highest population density area in the Township. However, internal density (persons per unit) is still at a reasonable (and average) level.

The predominant housing found in Neighborhood four (4) is row-type which was constructed prior to World War II. Half of the Township's central business district (CBD) is located in this neighborhood. The CBD will be discussed in the Land Use Plan section. Four Mile Creek Park is also located within this neighborhood which provides both active and passive recreational opportunities for the residents of the area.

Potential problems facing Neighborhood four (4) that should cause concern on behalf of Township officials include continued residential conversions, exterior property maintenance, and housing deterioration via the aging process. These problems will create the need for combative zoning and housing code standards to protect the majority of investments in the area.

Neighborhood Analysis Unit Number Five (5) is bounded by Main Street and Iroquois Avenue on the north, Lawrence Parkway on the west, the East Erie Commercial Railroad on the south and Nagle Road on the east.

This particular neighborhood experienced the second highest population loss as 132 persons less were recorded in 1980 than were counted in 1970. This 9.6% decline in population is a direct result of the smaller average family size experience of the Township. Even with this loss, Neighborhood five (5) is still the most heavily populated area in the Township (1,238 persons) and it also has the highest population density (12.8 persons per acre), despite the fact that its 408 dwelling units place only third highest (Neighborhoods 1 and 3 are above) among the six (6) neighborhoods in the Township. The reason for this can be found in the 100 resident population of the Twinbrook Medical Center and the higher persons per unit figure which this creates. When consideration to this fact is given and the group home population is deducted, a more reasonable rate of 2.79 persons per unit is resultant, which is just under the Township average of 2.82 persons per unit.

Approximately 25% of the neighborhood's 408 dwelling units are renter occupied and overall, the 101 rental units constitute about 40% of the total rental market (257 units) in the Township. Once again, the predominant housing type is pre-World War II row housing. It should be noted that while the exterior housing quality survey found this neighborhood's housing stock to be in good condition overall, there are several visible deteriorating structures that if not corrected, could be the impetus for future blight. Once again, as was the case in Neighborhood four (4), property maintenance is also regarded as an issue and the overall age of the housing stock should eventually warrant a conservation program.

The neighborhood contains about a 60% to 40% mix of R-1 (single) to R-2 (multi) family zoning respectively and while the recent ten year period resulted in only seven (7) additional dwelling units being created in the neighborhood, future rental conversion pressures are a possibility. As density levels within this neighborhood, especially the area west of Rankine Avenue to Four Mile Creek Park, are already the highest in the Township, it would be wise to consider future limitations on new conversions that create multi-family structures. The net residential density of this area is approximately 40 persons to each residential acre of land and there are 13.1 dwelling units per residential acre. Both of these statistics are high for the Township and are reaching the point of being dangerous to overall neighborhood stability.

The other land uses of Neighborhood five (5) are the remaining half of the CBD (to be discussed separately later), the Township's Four Mile Creek Park system, the Iroquois School District property and industrial property at the foot of Bell Street and at the intersection of Iroquois and Nagle Roads. While mixed land use problems are not obvious, the close proximity of the East Erie Commercial Railroad system and the industrial use at the foot of Bell Street add disruptive forces to the primary residential character of the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Analysis Unit Number Six (6) is 98% composed of the industrial land holdings of the General Electric Company, the rail systems and the industrial property south of the tracks abutting Harborcreek Township. The land that remains houses the smallest amount of the Township's population and the predominant form of housing is the mobile home due to the location of Gindy's Mobile Home Park which is located south of the rail right-of-way on land which is currently zoned B-1 local business. The residents of the mobile home park are geographically isolated from the remainder of Lawrence Park due to the rail system and lack of an immediate north traffic or pedestrian way. Due to this factor, there is more of a local government identity with nearby Wesleyville Borough and Harborcreek Township on behalf of the park residents. Due to the addition of new mobile homes in the park, the population of Neighborhood six (6) increased by 81 persons during the 1970-80 period and this accounted for a 69.2% population increase, which percentage-wise represented the Township's largest increase (numerically, it ranked second to Neighborhood three (3)).

The remaining residential area is located north of the tracks (and south of Bell Street) and consists of approximately twenty (20) single family homes and one (1) multi-unit. More than half of these units are renter occupied.

Future industrial use represents the most likely investments within this neighborhood and concern should be given to screening from adjacent neighborhoods as well as giving priority to industries that could benefit from the existing rail systems.

#### Neighborhood Synopsis

In order to determine the overall soundness and generally rate each neighborhood in the Township, a scoring matrix was developed and applied to a number of variables. The following chart includes the results of the neighborhood scoring. Each variable (listed in the vertical column) held a spread of points ranging from 0-5. The highest score possible was 40 points. The first four (4) variables in the chart were rated on the basis of rank while the final four (4) variables were rated subjectively based on in-field survey by the consultant. Neighborhood number two (2) was not ranked as it is the Golf Course property.

Table 13

Lawrence Park Township  
Comparative Neighborhood Characteristics  
Rating Matrix

<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>% of Occupied Housing</u>	<u>Net Density of Population</u>	<u>Housing Density</u>	<u>Persons Per Unit</u>	<u>Sub Total</u>
1	5	5	5	1	16
3	4	4	4	4	16
4	1	2	2	2	7
5	2	1	1	3	7
6	3	3	3	5	14

<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Amenities</u>	<u>Housing Quality</u>	<u>Aesthetics</u>	<u>Land Use Solidarity</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	5	5	5	5	20
3	5	4	4	4	17
4	3	3	3	3	12
5	2	3	3	3	11
6	1	3	3	3	10

<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Total Points</u>	<u>Rank</u>
1	36	First
3	33	Second
4	19	Fourth
5	18	Fifth
6	24	Third

---

Source: Consultant

---

It is important to note that the scoring method used is grounded in comparative analysis. In other words, the ranking is in relation to Lawrence Park only; the lowest ranked neighborhoods (Numbers 4 and 5) could well be rated much higher in other communities.

Also, it is important to note that other factors, which were not readily available on a neighborhood basis via Census releases (such as poverty level inhabitants, value of housing, and interior housing quality), could very well alter the results of this comparison. Generally, however, it is felt that the indicators used herein are representative of meaningful neighborhood comparative data.

# TOWNSHIP FISCAL ANALYSIS

This analysis presents a summary of recent trends in revenues and expenditures for Lawrence Park Township as well as a projection of the short-range fiscal situation of the Township. The intent of this analysis is to determine the Township's general capability to finance future capital projects and services.

The following table represents a simplified version of the Township's receipt experience for the past five (5) years. Detailed breakdowns of each category can be found in the respective Annual Audit and Financial Report for the given year in which it was prepared and submitted to the State.

Table 14

## Summary of Receipts Lawrence Park Township 1978-1982

<u>Receipts</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>
<u>Tax Receipts</u>					
Real Estate	\$ 220,835	\$ 220,576	\$ 228,986	\$ 249,572	\$ 156,382
Occupation	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	49,445
Act 511	395,089	411,761	475,478	437,527	421,720
Total Taxes	<u>\$ 615,924</u>	<u>\$ 632,338</u>	<u>\$ 724,464</u>	<u>\$ 687,099</u>	<u>\$ 627,547</u>
<u>Other Revenue</u>					
Licenses & Permits	\$ 2,890	\$ 3,091	\$ 2,818	\$ 12,805	\$ 7,566
Fines, Forfeits, Cost	10,174	13,160	12,046	12,189	12,168
Interest & Rents	128,430	240,154	278,782	355,463	347,007
Grants & Gifts	171,469	165,635	182,817	174,359	195,261
Departmental Earnings	7,325	7,030	6,394	93,696	212,354
Special Assessments & Liens	3,787	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Miscellaneous Revenue	429	131,720	96,152	32,766	52,087
Total Other Revenue	<u>\$ 324,503</u>	<u>\$ 560,789</u>	<u>\$ 579,009</u>	<u>\$ 681,280</u>	<u>\$ 826,444</u>
Total Taxes & Other Revenue	\$ 940,427	\$1,193,127	\$1,303,474	\$1,368,379	\$1,453,990
Non-Revenue <sup>1</sup>	\$ 407,775	\$ 380,674	\$ 481,284	\$ 600,285	\$ 615,089
Cash Balance <sup>2</sup>	(\$ 29,034)	\$ 33,075	\$ 67,507	\$ 86,251	\$ 118,130
Securities & Investments <sup>3</sup>	\$ 490,798	\$ 705,589	\$ 630,000	\$ 775,000	\$ 895,000
GRAND TOTAL	<u>\$1,809,965</u>	<u>\$2,312,465</u>	<u>\$2,482,265</u>	<u>\$2,829,915</u>	<u>\$3,082,210</u>

<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Interfund Transfers are included.

<sup>3</sup> Cash balance from previous year.

Securities & Investments held at beginning of the year.

Note: Totals may not add exactly due to rounding.

Source: Annual Audit and Financial Reports of Lawrence Park (1978-1982).

## RECEIPTS

Tax Revenues of the Township come from several sources: the real estate tax, the occupation privilege tax, the wage or earned income tax, the real estate transfer tax, and the small mechanical devices tax. All but the standard real estate tax are products of Pennsylvania Act 511 of 1965, the Local Tax Enabling Act.

By far, the largest tax receipt comes from the local wage tax. This tax comes from all working Township residents and is a fixed one(1) percent tax that is shared evenly between the Township and the School District. Over the past five (5) years, the wage tax has constituted 65.14% of all taxes received by the Township. The wage tax reached a high in 1980 when \$459,367 was collected. Due to the recent recession, this tax resource fell by \$55,135 or 12% by the end of 1982. The wage tax and all other Act 511 taxes are shown in the following table. The Occupation Privilege Tax, which is a \$10.00 per head tax charged to all who work in Lawrence Park, is a new tax which will offer the Township (and the School District which shares half of the tax) some relief over the decreasing wage tax and its recent loss in assessed valuation caused by the General Electric Company's appeal.

The real estate (deed) transfer tax generation also shows signs of being affected by the current recession as it is down from late 1970 decade levels. The transfer tax is a 2% tax which is collected by the County and split evenly with the State and the Township, on the occasion of real estate sales.

The small mechanical devices tax is a flat \$50.00 tax on amusement machines in the Township, and is the smallest tax revenue producer.

Table 15

Act "511" Local Tax Generation

<u>Year</u>	<u>Occupation Privilege Tax</u>	<u>Real Estate Transfer</u>	<u>Mechanical Devices</u>	<u>Wage Tax</u>	<u>Total</u>
1978	-0-	\$23,691	\$1,800	\$369,599	\$395,090
1979	-0-	21,822	1,750	388,190	411,761
1980	-0-	14,660	1,450	459,367	475,478
1981	-0-	15,869	1,500	420,158	437,527
1982	\$49,445	15,088	2,400	404,232	471,165

Source: Lawrence Park Annual Audit and Financial Reports (1978-1982).

Next to the wage tax, the real estate property tax is the highest tax revenue source. This tax reached its historical high in 1981, at \$249,572. However, an assessment appeal was made and relief was granted in County Court to the General Electric Company. This reduction in assessed valuation was the reason for the decline of close to \$93,190 of real estate tax dollars in the year 1982. In terms with the 1981 court settlement, the General Electric Company was awarded with a declining assessment base which will hit a low in the year 1985 and stabilize at 3.1 million in 1986. The following table includes the 1981 court approved General Electric

assessment rates as well as what these annual (40% Assessed Valuation) figures can be expected to generate in actual taxes. Comparative, pre-court settlement, years of 1979 and 1980 are also included.

Table 16

General Electric Company Assessment

<u>Tax Year</u>	<u>40% Assessed Valuation</u>	<u>Millage</u>	<u>Tax Levy</u>
1979	\$16,100,000	8.75	\$157,121
1980	\$11,300,000	9.75	\$110,175
1981	\$ 8,700,000	9.75	\$ 84,825
1982	\$ 6,500,000	9.75	\$ 63,375
1983	\$ 4,700,000	9.75	\$ 45,825
1984	\$ 3,200,000	9.75	\$ 31,200
1985	\$ 2,400,000	9.75	\$ 23,400
1986	\$ 3,100,000	9.75	\$ 30,225

---

Source: Lawrence Park Township Records, 1983.

---

The above figures do not include recent real property construction of the General Electric Company. The following figures represent the 40% assessed valuation level of the General Electric Company with new development added on top of the figures negotiated at the 1981 court settlement (as listed in the previous table): 1983 - \$5,760,620; 1984 - \$4,348,806; 1985 - \$3,546,271; and 1986 - \$4,246,291.

As General Electric Company property taxes have annually (prior to 1981) averaged well over 50% of the total real estate tax levy of the Township, the upcoming court approved schedule and new method of assessing new property added at the General Electric plant will adversely affect the revenue producing means of the property tax in Lawrence Park. For example, during the year 1979, the tax levy on the General Electric assessed valuation was \$157,121 or 69.9% of the total Township levy of \$224,640, while during the current year 1983 (which includes an additional \$13,648,825 in new property added at the plant), the General Electric levy is down to \$56,166 or 37.2% of the total levy.

The overall real estate tax situation of the Township for the past five (5) years is included in the following table:

Table 17

Trends in Assessed Valuation & Taxes Generated  
Lawrence Park Township  
1978-1982

<u>Year</u>	<u>Assessed Valuation 40%</u>	<u>Millage Rate</u>	<u>Tax Levy</u>	<u>Taxes Collected</u>	<u>Taxes Outstanding</u>
1978	\$25,606,812	8.75	\$224,060	\$220,835	\$3,175
1979	\$25,673,140	8.75	\$224,640	\$220,576	\$1,302
1980	\$25,700,488	9.75	\$250,580	\$248,987	\$1,453
1981	\$25,762,456	9.75	\$251,186	\$249,572	\$1,520
1982	\$16,234,336	9.75	\$158,285	\$156,382	\$1,330

Source: Lawrence Park Annual Audit and Financial Reports (1978-1982).

Last, in relation to taxes, the Township still has much of its taxing potential available should future revenue needs so dictate. The accompanying table, as extracted from the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs Taxation Manual (1980) is included for future reference.

Table 18

First Class Townships

<u>Potential Tax Sources</u>	<u>Legal Limit</u> <sup>1</sup>
<u>GENERAL PURPOSE TAX LEVIES</u>	
Real Estate	30 Mills <sup>2</sup>
Occupation	30 Mills <sup>2</sup>
Act 511 Taxes	
Per Capita	\$10
Occupation (Flat Rate)	\$10
Occupation (Millage)	No Limit
Occupational Privilege	\$10
Earned Income	1%
Deed Transfer	1%
Mechanical Devices	No Limit
Amusement	10%
Mercantile	1 Mill Wholesale
	1½ Mills Retail
Business Privilege	No Limit
<u>SPECIAL PURPOSE TAXES</u>	
Firehouses and Equipment	3 Mills <sup>3</sup>
Shade Trees	1/10 Mill
Municipal Building	No Limit
Debt Service	No Limit
Pensions and Retirement	1/2 Mill
Fire and Water District	2 Mills
Permanent Improvement Fund	5 Mills
Recreation	No Limit
Library	3 Mills
Ambulance and Rescue Squads	1/2 Mill

- 1 Home rule townships may set rates higher than the limits provided in state law for property taxes and for personal taxes levied on residents. They may not create new subjects of taxation.
- 2 Five additional mills available with court approval.
- 3 Higher rate may be approved by voters in referendum.

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, Taxation Manual, 1980.

Grants from federal, state and Erie County government also comprise a major portion of the Township's revenue resources. Categorically, grants and gifts placed third highest in the Township's 1982 year's receipts experience. The \$889,541 in grants that have been brought in during the past five (5) years has enabled the Township to directly and supplementally (with other Township finances) finance numerous projects. The following table includes the components of the annual grant resources of the Township. The two (2) major mainstay grants (State Liquid Fuels and Revenue Sharing) constituted 79% of all grants received in 1982, which was the high year for grants received. Both of these grants are based upon formulas that take various factors into effect. State Liquid Fuels is based upon the municipality's population and road mileage for the return of the state gasoline tax and revenue sharing is based upon a three (3) part formula that considers population, per capita income and the expenditures of a community. It is anticipated that both of these grants will be continuing.

Table 19

Grants Received by Source  
Lawrence Park Township  
1978-1982

<u>Year</u>	<u>State Highway Fund</u>	<u>Federal Revenue Sharing</u>	<u>County Liquid Fuel</u>	<u>Public Utility</u>	<u>Other Grants/Gifts</u>	<u>Totals</u>
1978	\$23,979	\$100,071	\$ 4,250	\$5,275	\$37,844	\$171,469
1979	\$24,721	\$105,913	-0-*	\$5,993	\$29,008	\$165,635
1980	\$27,678	\$113,549	-0-*	\$5,741	\$35,850	\$182,817
1981	\$24,906	\$116,165	\$ 4,250	\$8,305	\$20,734	\$174,359
1982	\$40,563	\$112,814	\$13,040	\$7,239	\$21,605	\$195,261

\* Grant held in escrow account for Township, used in 1982.

Source: Annual Audit and Financial Reports of Township (1978-1982).

The category entitled "Other Grants/Gifts" includes various single purpose grants generally always awarded for a one year period. Categorical (federal or state) grants are the most volatile and cannot be counted on for budgeting purposes. The County Liquid Fuels and Public Utility grants, while small, can, however, be expected to be ongoing grant receipt resources.

Other Revenue receipts brought into the Township are derived, in order of importance, through: interest, departmental earnings, miscellaneous revenue, fines/forfeits and costs, licenses and permits, and special assessments. The overall revenue category, excluding grants, has risen 412.45% during the past five (5) years from \$153,034 in 1978 to \$631,183. Interest earned by the Township has been the major contributor to this rapid rise as interest has grown by \$218,577 or 270.19% from \$128,430 in 1978 to \$347,007 in 1982. Interest in 1982 accounted for 54.97% of the total "Other Revenue" (excluding grants). The major source of interest income is from the "Special Revenue Fund" which provided \$229,568 in 1982. This amount came from the return of interest on unclaimed wage tax receipts.

Departmental earnings have been up the past two years due to sanitary sewer installations and billings. Miscellaneous revenue of \$52,087 in 1982 was made up of \$2,832 from Cable T.V., \$1,817 from Fire Insurance, and \$47,438 from the Police and Municipal Pension Funds. The remainder of the "Other Revenue" category, i.e. fines, forfeits, licenses and permits, are summarized in the table at the beginning of this analysis (see Table 14).

Non-Revenue Receipts provide the final category. The majority of receipts under this listing do not alter the net value of Township assets, for they are mainly interfund transfers. A receipt of \$12,736 was, however, recorded in this category in 1982 via contractual payments from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for snow removal.

## EXPENDITURES

The major categories of the Township's expenditure experience for the years 1978-1982 are shown on Table 20. Again, for a detailed breakdown of individual categories the reader is referred to the appropriate year's Annual Audit and Financial Report of the Township. The following table breaks the expenditures experience of the Township into two (2) basic categories: Government and Non-Government.

Table 20

Summary of Expenditures  
Lawrence Park Township  
1978-1982

<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>
Government Expenditures					
Administration	\$ 120,135	\$ 46,186	\$ 67,434	\$ 68,542	\$ 99,690
Tax Collection	6,801	9,595	9,888	10,439	11,832
Munic. Buildings	17,691	19,258	33,077	20,794	90,008
Police	167,059	206,034	212,325	207,166	260,633
Fire	20,969	50,839	56,612	19,089	20,850
Planning-Zoning-Reg.	3,902	10,567	9,453	17,196	7,060
Civil Defense	-0-	94	-0-	20	261
Health & Sanitation	184,031	210,283	242,982	308,473	331,259
Highways	161,214	586,063	344,913	329,832	203,050
Library	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Parks & Recreation	49,807	55,679	67,921	70,878	77,576
Miscellaneous	35,688	41,214	103,732	69,214	42,605
Interest	774	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Municipal Authority <sup>4</sup>	(6,270)	6,270	(5,738)	(5,738)	(5,738)
Total Government	\$ 771,070	\$1,245,082	\$1,151,340	\$1,124,643	\$1,147,824
Non-Government <sup>1</sup>	\$ 389,006	\$ 369,875	\$ 469,674	\$ 692,142	\$ 625,775
Cash Balance <sup>2</sup>	\$ 32,867	\$ 67,507	\$ 86,251	\$ 118,130	\$ 647,856
Securities & Investments <sup>3</sup>	\$ 617,022	\$ 630,000	\$ 775,000	\$ 895,000	\$1,095,000
GRAND TOTAL	<u>\$1,809,965</u>	<u>\$2,312,465</u>	<u>\$2,482,265</u>	<u>\$2,829,915</u>	<u>\$3,082,210</u>

<sup>1</sup> Non-Governmental includes transfers to other funds.

<sup>2</sup> Cash Balance left at the end of the year.

<sup>3</sup> Securities and Investments held at the end of the year.

<sup>4</sup> Represents the Township's pledge to the Tri-Community Recreation Authority. The annual pledge is made via the Township's Special Reserve Fund and totals shown during the 1978-1982 period are included within the Recreation or Miscellaneous expenditure categories.

Note: Totals may not add exactly due to rounding.

Source: Annual Audit and Financial Reports of Lawrence Park (1978-1982).

Government expenditures have risen \$376,754 or 49% from the \$771,070 spent in 1978 to the \$1,147,824 in 1982. This rate of expenditure has been well under the total of receipts (tax and other revenue) which rose by \$513,563 or 55% during the same period.

The highest annual governmental expenditures over the past five (5) years were: highway related expenses (\$1,625,072), health and sanitation (\$1,277,028) and police (\$1,053,217). Altogether, these three (3) basic Township services made up 72.7% of the total government expenditures during the past five (5) years, with highways accounting for 29.9%, health and sanitation 23.5% and police 19.3%. The remaining 27.3% of the Township's annual expenditures during the past five (5) years was not dominated by any one spending category.

It is interesting to note that, while spending increases have occurred in most categories, that the record indicates numerous fluctuating (rise and fall) spending experiences on a year to year basis. Only two (2) categories (Health and Sanitation and Parks and Recreation) have exhibited straight line increases during the past five (5) years.

Due to capital equipment and operating needs, annual expenses under both the municipal building and fire protection categories have fluctuated. The Lawrence Park Volunteer Fire Company annually conducts fund raising and, therefore, the monies shown in Table 20 represent only Township government's direct contribution. For example, during the year 1982, close to \$40,000 in additional revenue was generated by the Fire Company as a result of its fund raising activities.

Non-Government Expenses of the Township, as was the case with most of the non-revenue receipts, were almost completely comprised of bookkeeping transfers and as such, this category of expenses is irrelevant to the fiscal analysis.

Cash Balances remaining at the end of each budget year have been maintained. Most of the cash balance monies are a result of the Special Reserve Fund via the Earned Income or Wage Tax. These monies are normally transferred to the General Fund and the Investment Funds for use in the following year. The Cash Balance amount at the end of the year has been extremely important to the Township in the past two (2) years in enabling it to compensate for the revenue decline caused by the General Electric reassessment.

Securities and Investments of the Township have increased at a healthy rate during the past five (5) years to over the one million dollar mark. The cumulative five (5) year growth rate of 77.46% rendered an average 15.49% increase in the cash holding accounts of the Township. Of the 1982 year-end balance, \$636,000 or 58% of the total \$1,095,000 in securities and investments was held in the Capital Reserve Fund. The remaining investments were held in the six (6) other active operating funds of the Township.

Borrowing Capacity is the term used to signal the extent to which Township government can incur debt. Borrowing capacity is regulated by State law and is determined specifically by a formula prescribed by the Pennsylvania Local Government Unit Debt Act. For Lawrence Park Township, borrowing capacity is equal to 250% of its "borrowing base". The borrowing base is the average of total revenues (less certain exclusions) of the General Fund for the three (3)

most recent years, which for the period 1980-82, gave the Township a \$1,191,135 figure for the year 1983. The application of the aforementioned formula ( $\$1,191,135 \times 250\%$ ) renders a \$2,977,838 Non-Electoral Debt Limitation for Lawrence Park. This figure represents the maximum aggregate indebtedness that the Township can accumulate at any given time without the approval of the electorate. As the Township has no debts incurred, it is at 100% of its borrowing capacity.

#### FISCAL PROJECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to determine the future availability of funds for the operating and capital expenditure needs of the Township, a basic projection of revenue was made. The primary purpose of this projection is to provide insight into the Township's potential financial situation for the ensuing five year period based upon recent trends and known or anticipated short-term events. In order to project future income, a variety of methods were used. Each normal recurring income source included within the previous fiscal analysis was projected separately based upon various assumptions and/or factors. Some of the major assumptions and factors used in the revenue projection series are as follows:

- Population and housing growth will be very minimal during the upcoming five (5) years and the bulk of new tax value added will be via commercial and industrial property.
- Current (1983) tax and assessment rates have been utilized throughout the projection period. No County-wide reassessment is expected.
- The General Electric Company assessment and subsequent tax take of the Township will be based upon the 1981 court settlement and the value of new construction added at a fixed percentage rate of 7.77% which was derived during the 1979-83 experience. In regards to the latter, \$13,648,825 worth of new construction was added and the 40% assessed valuation was calculated at \$1,060,620 or 7.77% of total value. The 40% assessment figures projected for the General Electric Company are as follows: 1983 - \$5,760,620; 1984 - \$4,348,806; 1985 - \$3,546,271; and 1986 to 1988 - \$4,246,271.
- The current recession which has recently resulted in high unemployment among the Township's work force will continue to affect the earned income tax receipts of the Township through 1983, with marked improvement expected in 1984 and thereafter.
- The wage tax will continue to be the largest tax receipt, followed in importance by the real estate tax, occupational privilege and remaining "existing" Act 511 taxes. No new taxes or higher levies in existing rates of taxation have been programmed.
- Single purpose categorical grants have not been projected due to funding unknowns. No substantial gain is expected in the normal formula based (i.e. Revenue Sharing and Liquid Fuels) grants annually received by the Township due to growth conditions.

- Most of the "Other Revenue" items received by the Township will increase either proportionately to past experience or will be maintained at an average (1978-82) level.
- Interest earned on securities and investments will continue to be a major source of income to the Township. However, the increase will not be as dramatic as experienced in the 1978-82 period due to less investing and lower interest rates. Interest earned on the unclaimed wage tax will be reduced to around \$100,000 during the 1984-88 period.

With the preceding in view, the following income projections were developed for the Township for the years 1983-1988:

Table 21

Lawrence Park Township  
Five Year Projected Revenue & Other Receipts

<u>Revenue Source</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>
Real Estate Tax	\$ 149,150	\$ 136,295	\$ 129,528	\$ 138,198	\$ 139,643	\$ 141,088
Act 511 Taxes	<u>442,000</u>	<u>487,000</u>	<u>504,000</u>	<u>546,000</u>	<u>574,000</u>	<u>594,000</u>
Total Tax Revenue	\$ 591,150	\$ 623,295	\$ 633,528	\$ 684,198	\$ 713,643	\$ 735,088
Grants	\$ 213,890	\$ 186,700	\$ 192,650	\$ 193,350	\$ 205,750	\$ 213,250
Other Revenue	<u>\$ 437,810</u>	<u>\$ 447,000</u>	<u>\$ 456,000</u>	<u>\$ 475,000</u>	<u>\$ 480,000</u>	<u>\$ 510,000</u>
Total	<u>\$1,242,850</u>	<u>\$1,256,995</u>	<u>\$1,282,178</u>	<u>\$1,352,548</u>	<u>\$1,399,393</u>	<u>\$1,458,338</u>

Source: Consultant's projections.

Overall, the above income projections indicate a slight 17.3% five (5) year increase. As the current year is projected to be under the amount of receipts generated in 1982 (\$1,453,990), the amount projected for the year 1988 indicates that the Township will be forced to base future budgets on a static revenue producing basis.

The above projections do not include non-revenue transactions, cash balances or securities and investments held by the Township. Currently, considering the Township's debt free situation and investments held, the financial health of the Township should be considered well above average. There is, however, cause for short-term concern, due mainly to the loss of General Electric Company assessment and the anticipated lower rate of receipt of the unclaimed wage tax and interest earned on it, that

should create the need for more serious financial planning by the Township in the future in order that needed capital projects may be implemented and that Township services may be continued at its current quality level.

The following general recommendations would also benefit the Township in meeting its objective of fiscal responsibility:

- (1) Develop and annually update a local capital improvements program that covers a minimum and ongoing period of five (5) years.
- (2) Continue the pursuit of state and federal funds, to aid in financing necessary local projects and programs that are beyond full local participation.
- (3) Evaluate proposals for new development in terms of additional tax revenues produced versus increased costs of service to the Township.
- (4) Adopt subdivision and land development regulations to protect the Township by having the developer pay for all improvements at inception.
- (5) Commission independent financial feasibility studies to determine the cost-effectiveness of contracting versus Township operation of public services, i.e. street maintenance and refuse collection.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Comprehensive Plan for Lawrence Park Township contains five basic components: (1) a Statement of Goals and Objectives which are the foundation of the Comprehensive Plan, (2) the Land Use Plan, (3) the Housing Plan, (4) the Transportation Plan, and (5) the Community Facilities and Utilities Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is a development guide for Lawrence Park Township to the target year 2000. It is comprised of a series of recommendations which, if implemented, can assist in promoting and guiding community development. The power to implement the Plan recommendations rests with the elected Township Commissioners. It is this group of individuals that decides when and what recommendations are to be executed. Planning, however, is a continuing process and the Planning Commission, in its role as the major community advisory group to the Township Commissioners, must provide regular guidance to the local decision making process.

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Fundamentally, the community planning process involves the intelligent guidance and control of a municipality's growth and improvement. Community planning is based on the premise that existing conditions can be improved, future needs can be fulfilled, and steps can be undertaken to develop and maintain a desirable physical, social and economic environment within the community.

In planning, it is an axiom that every municipality is unique, and no standardized concepts or patterns of development can be expected to validly apply to all communities. Rather, it is necessary that each community decide for itself how it wants to grow and the kind of community it wants to be. Therefore, the first step in formulating a comprehensive planning program for Lawrence Park is to determine general goals and objectives which will reflect what it expects or hopes to achieve through planning.

A goal can be defined as a desirable state toward which one is working. To maintain their long-term validity, the goals must be general in nature and reflect the desire to provide an attractive community with quality neighborhoods, schools, recreation facilities and other public facilities, plus employment opportunities.

Planning objectives describe specific facets of each goal in terms of attainable conditions and thereby indicate more precisely the individual components that make up the goal. From these plan goals and objectives, one can then begin to analyze a community's characteristics and develop specific recommendations or projects to intelligently guide and control a municipality's growth and improvement.

#### Land Use Goal

To maintain and perpetuate a land use pattern which includes a wide variety of inter-related land uses in proper proportion to the needs and land area of the Township, and one which provides compatibility with existing neighborhood development and the natural environment.

### Objectives

- (1) Protect the existing residential neighborhoods of the Township from future mixed land uses that would alter and deter the living environment.
- (2) Require high property maintenance standards of all property owners in the Township.
- (3) Limit the strip commercial development on East Lake Road to the north side from the City line to Joliette Avenue.
- (4) Maintain the pure single family residential character of neighborhood unit number one (1).
- (5) Reserve all public and institutional lands within the Township for the environmental, recreation, education, aesthetic, cultural and civic needs of existing and future residents.
- (6) Limit and confine apartment and multi-family residential to its current location in order to avoid high density neighborhood situations and further encroachment within single family areas.
- (7) Require that any major, new subdivision provide a density of development that is consistent with adjacent neighborhoods.
- (8) Promote the revitalization of the Central Business District by encouraging private and public investments.
- (9) Reserve the lands south of the East Erie Commercial Railroad for future industrial use, and maintain existing designated industrial zones at present scale for short-term expansion needs.

### Environmental Goals

To preserve, enhance and coordinate the natural and man-made environment of the Township.

- (1) Restrict new development within the environmental corridors of the Township and prohibit structural development within identified flood plain areas.
- (2) Promote the use of aesthetically pleasing landscaping practices in all new development.
- (3) Encourage the elimination, isolation or screening of all scenic detriments.
- (4) Avoid further structural encroachment on the Lake Erie bluffs.
- (5) Control the use of signs in terms of number, size, type and location and encourage attractiveness and uniformity in their design.

- (6) Promote innovative development concepts such as planned residential development which encourages variety in neighborhood design and mandates the reservation of common open space.
- (7) Maintain and enforce provisions to accommodate the safe runoff of storm water and protect the storm water channels.

#### Housing Goal

Provide adequate housing for the present and future residents of Lawrence Park Township.

- (1) Maintain the diversity in housing types and residential neighborhoods so that a reasonable choice of living environment is possible.
- (2) Preserve the existing housing stock through the use of public and private actions and incentives that encourage housing quality and maintenance.
- (3) Eliminate substandard housing units by removing those which cannot be salvaged and by rehabilitating those units that can be feasibly salvaged.
- (4) To encourage residential apartment type uses at reasonable density as a secondary use in the Central Business District.
- (5) To assist the low and moderate income elderly of the Township and maintain their residence in the community through development of public housing in a convenient location.
- (6) Protect and preserve structures and neighborhoods that are historically significant.
- (7) Restrict further apartment conversions within established single family dwellings.

#### Transportation Goal

To provide the safe and convenient circulation and movement of goods and people within the Township and to points beyond utilizing all methods practical.

- (1) Provide for the separation of through and local traffic in order to facilitate movement both within the community and between neighboring municipalities.
- (2) Coordinate and integrate the transportation systems of the Township with that of the region.
- (3) Protect the traffic capacity of all roads in the Township with specific emphasis on East Lake Road, Iroquois Avenue and Lawrence Parkway.
- (4) Promote safe and convenient internal traffic movement within the Township by eliminating dangerous road conditions, hazardous intersections and the avoidance of future indirect connections to existing highways.


- (5) Provide for pedestrian walkways wherever warranted by vehicular traffic and other activities.
- (6) Provide for adequate street systems and off-street parking in all future developments.
- (7) Provide for public mass transit services in conjunction with the Erie Metropolitan Transit Authority.
- (8) Provide safe bikeways along the Township's major arteries that connect with adjacent community bikeways.

#### Public Facilities and Services Goal

To provide for facilities, services and utilities of the quantity and quality necessary to meet the physical, social, safety, cultural and recreation needs of the Township and to do so in a fiscally responsive manner.

- (1) Maintain adequate police and fire protection throughout the community.
- (2) Provide for adequate public water and sewer services in all areas of the community where existing or planned development or population densities warrant such services.
- (3) Maintain a community parks and recreation system offering a wide range of recreational opportunities for local residents within walking distance of all neighborhoods.
- (4) Provide for orderly and timely expenditures through capital improvements programming to reflect the public facility needs of the community.
- (5) Provide for adequate Township facilities for the effective management of the community.

**Public & institutional numbers refer to text**



On the existing land use map, these lands are depicted according to actual functional use. For example, Township Parks are shown as recreational while structural facilities such as schools and churches are designated institutional irregardless of ownership. The Land Use Plan (see map) accommodates most all of the existing public and institutional lands as well as a few privately owned (e.g. the Lawrence Park Golf Course and some General Electric property) lands under the Conservation category. The remaining public and institutional uses that are not included within the Conservation designation (e.g. churches) are uses which should blend in within any particular overall land use designation (e.g. residential or commercial) and should be accommodated within zoning policies.

The Conservation District's major purpose is to retain land that is necessary for the environmental (flood plain and storm drainage), educational, and recreational needs of the Township. Perhaps the most visible and necessary portion of the Conservation Plan is the open space buffer between the General Electric Plant and the residential neighborhoods centered on Main Street. Presently, zoning allows for commercial development within this area. The provision was incorporated to accommodate off-street parking on this site. While the zoning should accommodate off-street parking, it should not allow for potential changes to commercial. The longer term impact of the Water Street Expressway proposal could also exert commercial pressures in the area and this should not be encouraged since it would adversely affect the safety and traffic carrying capacity of the improved road system as well as impact on the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

#### Vacant

The amount of potentially developable land that remains in Lawrence Park is limited and comprises about 163 acres or 13.8% of the total land area of the Township. Not all of this vacant land is residential in current or preferred designation via zoning. About 90-100 acres of the total is located south of the East Erie Commercial Railroad and is either owned by various rail systems that occupy the area, the Pennsylvania Electric Company, or private concerns.

The Lawrence Park Golf Course, which is categorized as a recreational land use, several other parks, easements and right-of-ways of utility companies are not included as vacant lands as all are being used according to their intended function.

The ramifications of this limited land situation have been discussed and were taken into consideration in the population analysis (see Table 8). The land use plan proposes that all vacant lands be developed in the future and that the only two (2) forms of development that are acceptable are residential and industrial in nature. The single family designation is recommended for all residential land use that is currently vacant and light industrial use is recommended in the southern portion of the Township.

#### Residential

Approximately 20.9% of the Township's total land area or 246 acres is in the residential designation. In 1980, the net housing density of this land was 6.6 units per acre.

Approximately one-third of the total residential land area is composed of two and multi-family structures. The approximate 82 acres of multi-family is concentrated in the older areas of the Township in neighborhoods 4 and 5 and there is a need to contain future conversion activity within and adjacent to already established areas. The Land Use Plan map, therefore, allows for some additional area abutting the already existing multi-family area for future conversions and multi-family market needs. A comparative observation of the two (2) land use maps will avail the reader of these nominal but reasonable additions. Again, it is the position of the Township that further infiltration of multi-family situations into established single-family neighborhoods must be avoided in the future to limit neighborhood densities and preserve traditional single-family investments. The low density designation (on the Land Use Plan map) is to accommodate the single family environment while the medium density designation includes two and multi-family situations as well as the mobile home park.

In addition to this modest expansion of multi-family housing, the remainder of the Township's residential land use is proposed to remain single family in its present form. Also, the vacant lands that do remain, that are shown on the existing Land Use Map, should be developed at single family residential (low) densities that are compatible with adjacent neighborhoods (e.g. the land abutting the Lakeside Subdivision in the northwest corner of the Township).

The major potential residential concern is the development of the Lawrence Park Golf Course property. While it is not anticipated that the Golf Course will be abandoned for this more active (residential) use during the period of this comprehensive plan (to the year 2000), the fact that the site is located within the urban area and has all facilities and utilities available would make it an attractive candidate in the future should market conditions for residential development increase. While it is the desire and intent of the Township to maintain the present joint conservation and recreation use of this land for the longer term future, it would be prudent to have immediate access to a contemporary and well thought out Planned Residential Development Ordinance. This ordinance would specify the use, density, recreation, conservation, facility and utility standards, that would constitute the rules of development of this site.

The preparation and adoption of a traditional Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance would be a satisfactory management tool for the limited other possible development situations in the Township.

### Industrial

Approximately 372 acres are currently held under industrial use within the Township, making this classification the most active land use in the Township. This acreage represents 31.6% of the total area in the Township and the General Electric Company is the predominating land holder. The General Electric Company plant is the largest industrial employer and major installation in Erie County. It constitutes the most intensive land use element in the community. The General Electric is well buffered from the community by major highways and internal building setbacks and screening. Recent expansion activities and announcements of the continuing need for an Erie based operation have been made by the General Electric Company. They have been well received and indicate with some sense of security that the General Electric will continue to be functioning within the Township for years to come.

The other industrial users in the Township are the rail systems and Penelec in the southern area of the Township, East Side Machine Products at Iroquois Avenue and Nagle Road, and Tanner Manufacturing behind the School District property on Bell Street.

The Land Use Plan provides for the continuing use of all of the aforementioned, as well as room for new industrial expansion in the southern portion of the Township, where the rail facilities are advantageous and land is sectioned off from the remainder of the residential community. Future industrial development within this area should meet high standards with respect to environmental performance so as not to cause any adverse impact on neighboring residential areas. Particular attention should be devoted to screening and buffering around the mobile home park which is expected to be a longer term continuing use in the lower (south) portion of the Township.

### Commercial

Only 15 acres or a small 1.3% of the total land area of the Township is actively devoted to commercial use. There are four (4) areas within the Township which either currently house commercial uses and/or could be subjected to further pressures for commercial zoning designations in the future: (1) East Lake Road, (2) Iroquois Avenue, (3) Lawrence Parkway, and (4) the Central Business District. Of these, the Central Business District is recognized as the major commercial area in the Township and its current problems demand joint public and private action to reverse its declining situation. A separate Central Business District analysis and plan immediately follow this section. Further zoning policies should not provide competition to the Central Business District. Due to the small community atmosphere of Lawrence Park, the need to centralize activities should be a priority. Zoning to accommodate regional or arterial pass-through trade should be downplayed in the future and as previously stated, no commercial development at all is recommended for Lawrence Parkway. Both the East Lake Road and Iroquois Avenue corridors are in need of future commercial zoning containment.

Access and egress to the residential area in the northern portion of the Township, next to the Golf Course, is already troublesome with the high volume of traffic along East Lake Road, and further ribbon development past Joliette Avenue would only further compound the problem. The few other existing commercial uses (hotel, restaurant and tavern) that are spotted off of East Lake Road (see existing land use map) should be regarded as longer term, nonconforming uses by the Township and zoning policies should not encourage additional commercial development next to these uses.

Iroquois Avenue, likewise, should not be permitted to further develop commercially. The parcel that was recently rezoned (the old Primary School site) for an extended elderly care facility should mark the beginning of the commercial district which would run through to the Harborcreek Township line on the north side only.

CITY OF ERIE

LAKE ERIE

WARREN TOWNSHIP

WARREN TOWNSHIP


CITY OF ERIE

WILKESVILLE BOROUGH

WARREN TOWNSHIP

EXISTING LAND USE

- Residential
- Business
- Public & Institutional
- Recreational
- Industrial
- Open space



LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP

PROPERTY MAP

ERIE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA



## THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT

A primary objective of the Township is to encourage the revitalization and development of the Central Business District (CBD). This is the major commercial land use element. Currently, the CBD contains approximately thirty(30) small parcels of land and runs along Main Street a couple of parcels west of Rankine Avenue to Iroquois Avenue. While there are a number of retail and institutional uses in the CBD, there is an absence of an organized theme and variety of retail attractions. The following list of current (1983) CBD residents has been arranged to identify the existing downtown market mix. The narrative has been arranged to identify the locations on a west to east basis, on both sides of Main Street.

### Southern Side of Main Street

- (1) U.E. Union Hall (southeast corner of Main and Rankine).
- (2) U.E. Parking Lot (behind Union Hall on Rankine).
- (3) A large vacant building (fronting Main Street at Rankine on the southwest corner) which is currently being renovated as a large ethnic restaurant. Space is also being made available for the relocation of a local Pot Pourri Shop. An attached structure to the rear of the building exists and is abandoned.
- (4) The Lawrence Park Athletic Club (on Rankine Avenue) is located behind a vacant lot that is immediately adjacent to the aforementioned (#3) structure.
- (5) A vacant building (formerly housing Rainbow's End) is located on Main Street between the Lawrence Park Diner and the large building which is currently being renovated (#3). This building will shortly be put into reuse as a hardware store.
- (6) The Lawrence Park Diner and Parking Lot are located between #5 and #7 on Main Street.
- (7) The Donut Shop and a Custom Upholstery Shop are located on the corner of Main and Silliman.
- (8) The First National Bank and Parking Lot is located at the southeast corner of Main and Silliman.
- (9) The Keystone Gas Station is located next to the Bank property at the corner of Main and Smithson.
- (10) The Jehovah's Witnesses Kingdom Hall is located at the southwest corner of Main and Smithson next to School District property.

### Northern Side of Main Street

- (11) Ma's Place Tavern and Parking Lot (abutting #12 to the west).
- (12) Irish Cousins Tavern (northwest corner of Main and Rankine).

- (13) The Karate Spa and a Barber Shop are located on the northeast corner of Main and Rankine.
- (14) A pottery studio is located between #13 and #15.
- (15) The Batchelor Hardware Building (between #14 and #16) which is currently vacant.
- (16) The Mobil Service Station located at Main and Silliman with the Township Building and Post Office located immediately behind it.
- (17) The Lawrence Park Volunteer Fire Company Building and Parking Lot covering two parcels, is located at the northwest corner of Main and Silliman.
- (18) The Erie County School Employee's Federal Credit Union building (between #17 and #19).
- (19) The District Justice Office Building (next to #20).
- (20) The Village Grocery is located at the northwest corner of Main and Smithson.
- (21) The Count and Countess Hairstylists located at the northeast corner of Main and Smithson.
- (22) The Park Family Practice Building.
- (23) The American's Realtors Building.
- (24) Lawson's Grocery and Parking Lot (open to Iroquois and Main Street traffic).
- (25) The Dairy Queen Drive-In fronting Iroquois Avenue.
- (26) The ARCO Service Station located at the point of Main Street and Iroquois Avenue.

In summary, this listing indicates that the downtown is nearly void of specialized retail activity. This trade has been captured at nearby shopping centers. Other problems that are founded in the CBD include a few inherent deteriorating structures, lack of a coordinated development theme and the existence of older buildings that will require fairly large amounts of capital investments to convert into new opportunities. Due to the fact that ample off-street parking is not available, the larger scale commercial investor would naturally prefer one of the nearby shopping locations.

The larger of the competing shopping areas is located on Buffalo Road south of Lawrence Park in Harborcreek Township. This has become an expanded shopping center serving the east side of Erie and the eastern suburbs. These shopping centers contain super markets and supporting shopping facilities, together with junior department stores. A second shopping center is located at the northeast corner of the Township along East Lake Road. The Harborcreek Mall located at this site provides an enclosed mall and a shopping facility with some adjacent commercial uses. Either of these shopping centers would be adequate in size to replace the commercial center in Lawrence Park. Both together overwhelm the

prospects for a convenience shopping center located within the Township. In addition to the competition of these new shopping centers, the Main Street complex has the aforementioned listed limitations which it must overcome (e.g. the lack of economical space for expansion, shortage of parking spaces, and obsolescence of structures).

The options for improvement of the Central Business area are limited. However, workable solutions do exist which can foster the rejuvenation of this vital area. The strategy for improvement calls for building on the strong uses which now exist, by installing off-street parking areas between the business area and adjacent residential uses, encouraging small retail stores, specialized shops and service establishments, construction of housing facilities for the elderly, and by the installation of a new Municipal Building in the center of the area. Future consideration should also be given to encouraging private residential apartment construction above ground floor commercial uses in new as well as existing buildings. An overall Central Business District Improvements Program should also be developed that provides for public action for the spot acquisition and clearance of the few existing blighted or undesirable structures, as well as providing for the rehabilitation of several buildings (under common architectural facade theme).

The off-street parking needs should be met directly behind the businesses that front the Central Business District, so as to provide immediate pedestrian access. A concept plan is shown on the accompanying page. In concept, the plan would provide an intimate Central Business District, oriented primarily to pedestrians which is more intensively built than at present and which would utilize landscaped parking areas as a buffer from adjacent residential areas. The new Municipal building would occupy the Northwest corner of Main and Silliman, the site presently used by the Mobile Service Station. The old, converted house which now serves inadequately as Township offices would be razed and replaced with off-street parking. Parking would be extended westward to Rankine to the rear of the shops now fronting on Main Street.

Off-street parking would also be provided south of Main Street to the rear of commercial frontage from Rankine to Smithson. The provision of these parking areas serves multiple purposes. It provides an important amenity--common in new shopping centers, but too rare in older business districts--for encouraging and accommodating small businesses. Equally important, perhaps, is its second purpose, the improvement of the pedestrian values on Main Street. The plan does not call for the establishment of a Mall which would close Main Street to traffic (such a step is simply inappropriate to the needs of Lawrence Park) but does propose to emphasize the pedestrian by reducing traffic conflict and assigning more space to sidewalks and landscaping. The intensification of uses in the business district will also benefit pedestrians by eliminating uninteresting voids and reducing the number of potentially hazardous curb cuts and driveway entrances which cross pedestrian ways.

The concept plan also shows the potential use of the present Keystone Service Station property which is located at the southeastern corner of Main and Smithson Avenue, next to the First National Bank property, as a site for elderly housing. Other site options are possible, and could very well serve the goal of Central Business District renovation and reuse. The aspect that

should be recognized is that the need for a location close to or within the business area is just as important to the elderly as it is to the business community. In addition to this mutuality of support, the new housing construction will in itself, as the new Township building would, improve the appearance of the area and further the goals of renovation.

New commercial construction is anticipated by the plan. Good opportunities for new buildings are available--particularly along the south side of Main Street. With additional parking to the rear of these properties, a viable market for small specialized shops and services will be recognized and exploited.

Once again, the Plan does not call for extensive downtown redevelopment, but rather for the spot clearance, rehabilitation and adaptation of existing structures, and for the judicious investment of available public funds to entice and support private investment. A Parking Authority can easily carry out the acquisition and improvement of land for off-street parking, and the services of the Erie County Redevelopment Authority may be available for the few internal Central Business District acquisition and clearance needs. The latter, of course, would necessitate the use of Federal/State community development funds. This, together with the construction of the much needed Municipal Building, are the major expenditures to be made with public monies. The return in terms of enhanced living, improved environment, and stabilized property values, will be substantially greater than the cost.

#### Summary and Listing of Other Land Use Plan Recommendations


- (1) Amend the Zoning District Map to more closely align with the intent of the Land Use Plan Map.
- (2) Amend the Zoning Ordinance text to provide for current State Act 247 - PA Municipalities Planning Code - standards.
- (3) Amend the Zoning Ordinance to provide for standards governing the use and location of group homes, multi-family housing and residential conversions.
- (4) Amend the Zoning Ordinance to provide for an overlay Flood Plain District, as was identified in the Federal Insurance Administration's Flood Insurance Study for Lawrence Park.
- (5) Adopt a Planned Residential Development Ordinance for potential longer term use in managing large scale development opportunities at Golf Course property.
- (6) Adopt a traditional (Act 247 based) Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for management of limited small scale development opportunities.
- (7) Consider the adoption of a Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance (LERTA) Ordinance that would provide tax abatement for a five (5) year period to new development in the Central Business District. The LERTA boundaries should parallel the Central Business District boundaries as are depicted on the Development Concept Plan Map. The Ordinance should be adopted by the Township, School District, and County for full tax abatement benefit. Consideration should be given to adopting the County Ordinance for administrative and fiscal (abatement) uniformity. The County Ordinance waives the improvements of new and/or substantial rehabilitation on commercial development in a certified LERTA district for a period of five (5) years. Only the original (before value added)

property tax would be applied to the property during the five (5) year period. The basic concept behind LERTA is that the benefits gained by the community in the longer term (property tax and jobs) outweigh the initial short term loss of revenue to the community. The Township could use LERTA as an incentive to draw in new business and rehabilitate its Central Business District.


- (8) Make application for a Small Communities Development Program Planning Grant through the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs to develop a complete Central Business District development program that would specify the exact capital project needs and costs of property acquisition, clearance, and rehabilitation. The primary objective of this planning project would be to firm up the actual details prior to implementation. The Central Business District planning process should include the involvement of the Planning Commission and the local downtown merchants, as well as identify all future funding responsibilities and sources. After the final plan is developed, then application should be made to any or all State or Federal funding sources that support economic development activities. Currently, the Small Communities Program of the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs provides an economic development hardware funding program of this nature. However, it is very competitive and the awards that have been granted thus far have been to those projects that average equal to greater dollar amounts of private capital and create new or retain existing jobs. Other funding programs may be available to the Township subsequent to final planning and those that are known to be of current practicality are included within the Appendix.
- (9) Continue to enforce the existing property maintenance code throughout the Township on a uniform basis and update/upgrade regulations for the mobile home park.
- (10) Promote the industrial development assets of the land in the southern portion of the Township. The urban location, immediate availability of rail and arterial access, and available labor force of the area are all assets that should be conveyed to the Erie Employment Task Force and Erie County Industrial Development Authority for their future recruitment purposes. Financial programs geared to assist existing and potential manufacturing industries interested in expanding or building anew in Lawrence Park are described in the Appendix.
- (11) Encourage the use of historic preservation tools for the townhouses located along Main Street just east of Four Mile Creek and the house located on the north side of East Lake Road on the east bank of Four Mile Creek. The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 provides private tax incentives to spur revitalization of historic properties and neighborhoods. Ongoing coordination with the Erie County Historical Society would also be advantageous.


# LAND USE PLAN

- Low Density Residential
- Medium Density Residential
- Business
- Industrial
- Conservation
- Flood Plain



LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP  
PROPERTY MAP  
ERIE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA





**CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT**

North  
100 0 300

## HOUSING PLAN

During recent years it has become evident that the quality of housing has a definite influence on the welfare of a community and the well being of its residents. Housing is essentially the sheltering of people. It also provides a sense of place and a sense of individual and social identity. The quality of housing can command pride and respect or create an atmosphere of despair and unrest.

The availability of safe, sound and attractive housing is a significant "community" resource. If a community has an adequate supply of sound housing and the potential to expand its housing stock according to future needs, it is usually considered as a desirable place to live and raise a family. However, if the present housing stock is physically and functionally substandard with minimal opportunity for rehabilitation efforts and the construction of new housing units, then a community or a neighborhood within a particular community may be considered as an undesirable living area or environment.

Once such areas become labeled as undesirable and/or substandard, problems seem to multiply, i.e., physical deterioration and blight accelerate, community support facilities and services may diminish, overcrowding increases, and the area generally becomes a liability to the community. With these considerations in mind, it is easy to understand why a housing element is included with a comprehensive plan. The Housing Plan which follows includes several basic components: (1) inventory of the existing housing market; (2) a field survey of housing conditions; (3) an identification of existing problems; (4) a projection of future housing needs; and (5) recommended approaches to handle existing problems and to meet the future needs. As noted previously in the statement of Goals and Objectives, the basic goal of the Housing Plan is to provide an adequate housing supply for the present and future residents of Lawrence Park Township. The objectives listed in the overall community development statement represent the specific direction under which the recommendations were formulated.

### HOUSING MARKET

#### Supply

The 1980 Census revealed that there were 1,627 total housing units within Lawrence Park. This represented an overall 212 unit gain or a 15% increase from the 1970 total supply of 1,415 units. Under the Bureau of Census definition of housing unit, single-family homes, mobile homes, and units within housing structures (such as apartments, flats and single rooms) whether occupied or vacant but intended for occupancy are all taken into consideration. Of the total 1980 supply, 1,588 units or 97.6%, were determined to be available year-round units. A vacancy rate of 2.4% was tabulated based upon a count of 39 vacant units. Of the vacant structures that were identified, ten (10) were for sale, 14 were for rent, 3 were held for occasional use, and 12 were categorized as "other" vacants by the Census. Considering the type of vacancies revealed by the Census and the in-field inspection of housing quality in 1983, the Township is very fortunate to have this low vacancy rate. It is obvious that market conditions are quick to absorb housing when it is available for

sale or rent and this a direct result of well maintained housing and pleasing neighborhoods. The Township's vacancy rate is one of the lowest in Erie County.

According to Township records, only a handful of building permits have been issued since 1980 and most of these have been for alterations and/or additions. The high mortgage rate situation and overall inflation that has devastated the housing market on the national scale has also impacted upon Lawrence Park. This latter statement must also be tempered with the fact that little land is available for new housing.

#### Type

The most predominant type of housing available within the Township is single-family. A total of 1,452 units of the total stock is categorized by the Census as one (1) unit structures. The one (1) unit structure total makes up 89.24% of the entire Township housing stock of 1,627 units. A total of 39 units were recorded as being vacant.

Of the total one (1) unit structures, 965 units are detached and 487 units are attached. This is due to the large number of row houses found in the Township which is a unique factor in Erie County.

The remaining 10.76% of Lawrence Park's total housing stock is composed of units within two (2) and multi-unit structures. The breakdown of this percentage is as follows: 63 units in two (2) family structures, 29 units in three (3) and four (4) family structures, and 29 units in five (5) or more structures.

Mobile homes, due to the one mobile home park in the Township, are a relatively new type of housing in the Township, and it is anticipated that more of these units will be added in the future through park expansion activities. The 1980 Census recorded 54 mobile homes in the Township.

#### Tenure

In terms of tenure, Lawrence Park's housing stock is predominantly owner occupied (1,329 of the total 1,588 occupied units). Rental units comprise only 15.91% (259 units) of the total supply. In comparison, Erie County's supply of rental housing units to total supply stands at 26.9%. The Township's rental stock is primarily constituted of single-family homes. Rental housing demand could increase within the Township in future years as more and more families become priced out of the housing market. The mobile home and optional forms of multi-family housing represent viable alternatives to this potential rental demand.

#### Age

The age of Lawrence Park's housing stock is a good indicator of future housing maintenance needs. The Township's housing stock is an aged one. About 47% of the total housing stock was built before the year 1939 and is, therefore, in excess of forty (40) years in age. It is also interesting to note that of the 259 rented units tabulated in the 1980 Census, that approximately 79% were constructed prior to 1939. This is a characteristic that is generally founded within cities or older urban communities. The following chart illustrates

the age of the Township's housing supply.

Age of Housing  
Lawrence Park Township

<u>Construction Period</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>%</u>
1939 or Before	772	47.45
1940 to 1949	205	12.60
1950 to 1959	318	19.55
1960 to 1969	230	14.14
1970 to 1974	82	5.04
1975 to 1978	13	.80
1979 to 1980	7	.43

Source: Bureau of Census, 1980.

Value

Lawrence Park Township's value of housing increased at an astronomical rate during the 1970-80 period due to inflation which has affected the cost of new construction as well as existing housing that is offered for sale. Between the two (2) census years (1970 and 1980) a 150% increase was established in the median value of owner occupied housing. The 1980 Census rendered a median value of \$38,900, up \$23,400 from the 1970 Census established median value figure of \$15,500. The value of Lawrence Park's owner occupied housing was slightly lower than that of the County and State median figures of \$39,700 and \$39,100 respectively. The following chart identifies the value of owner occupied housing by value for the Township:

Value of Owner Occupied Housing  
Lawrence Park Township - 1980

<u>Value</u>	<u>Number</u>
Less than \$10,000	8
\$10,000 to \$14,999	14
\$15,000 to \$19,999	47
\$20,000 to \$24,999	102
\$25,000 to \$29,999	167
\$30,000 to \$34,999	171
\$35,000 to \$39,999	99
\$40,000 to \$49,999	195
\$50,000 to \$79,999	318
\$80,000 to \$99,999	32
\$100,000 to \$149,999	16
\$150,000 to \$199,999	2
\$200,000 or more	0
Median Value	\$38,900

(See next page for footnotes)

---

Note: the above distribution is restricted to certain kinds of "owner-occupied" or "vacant for sale only" units. The following are excluded from the tabulations on value: (a) units at an address with two or more units; (b) units on 10 or more acres; (c) units with a commercial establishment or medical office on the property; (d) mobile homes or trailers.

Source: Bureau of Census, 1980.

---

### Condition

As part of the planning process, a field survey of housing distribution and condition was undertaken during the month of June 1983. The results of this survey are partially included in the Township Neighborhood Analysis chapter of this document. This section will focus more on the overall condition of housing.

The field survey undertaken during 1983 was geared to accommodate comparison with a survey which was taken by the County Planning Department in 1967 as part of the Township's original comprehensive planning program. Both surveys relied on in-the-field windshield surveys of external housing features. The categorization of housing quality via observations that are made on external features is not a perfect process; interior conditions may well be deficient within some structures that are judged to be standard which would obviously further increase the number of substandard housing units in the community. In any event, the following criteria was utilized in the 1983 survey, as it was in the 1967 survey:

#### Criteria for Evaluation & Classification In An Exterior Structural Survey

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>
Standard	Structure in good condition, not in need of repairs.
Conservation	Minor deficiencies requiring small expenditures to raise condition of structure to a standard condition.
	Examples:
	Paint Job
	Pointing of bricks
	Replace gutters and/or downspouts
	Minor roof repairs
	Rotting window sills.

Criteria for Evaluation & Classification  
In An Exterior Structural Survey

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>
Rehabilitation	<p>Major deficiencies requiring large expenditures to raise condition of structure to standard condition.</p> <p>However, project should not amount to the total reconstruction of the structure. Any two of the examples below will classify a structure as eligible for rehabilitation.</p> <p>Sagging porches Rotting foundations Rotting exterior steps Loose wall and chimney bricks Sagging roofs Rotting siding Rotting roofing</p>
Clearance	<p>Structure having a number of major deficiencies and is clearly unfit for habitation and is structurally unsound. Three or more of the above listed examples will classify a structure for clearance.</p>

The results of the recent 1983 housing quality survey are shown in the following table. As can be observed, it is the general finding of the survey that housing conditions have actually improved during the past 16 years. The number of units judged to be in need of conservation has decreased substantially; a decrease of 350 units needing conservation was established. This trend is a very positive sign. However, the current number of units (269) in need of conservation is still rather high. It should be noted that those units that were judged to be in need of conservation are close to being standard units.

The 1983 survey did, however, parallel the findings of the 1967 survey as far as location of the conservation needs. Neighborhoods 4 and 5 are still the most in need of exterior housing conservation efforts. All in all, 269 units were judged to be in need of conservation via the 1983 housing survey; this translates to 16.5% of the entire Township housing stock (1,627 units).

The 25 units that were judged to be in need of rehabilitation were also predominantly located in neighborhoods 5 and 6, with the only dilapidated structures found in neighborhood five (5). All totaled, the 27 units that were judged to be very substandard (rehabilitation and clearance) made up only 1.5% of the entire housing stock. These units would be obvious inspection targets for a municipal code enforcement program. In relation to the 1967 survey, the recent survey showed that the amount of very substandard housing has remained just about the same in terms of number and location.

Table 22

Neighborhood Housing Quality  
Lawrence Park - 1983

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Standard</u>							
1967	362	-	345	50	11	-	768
1983	401	1	427	176	264	62	1,331
<u>Conservation</u>							
1967	23	-	42	197	357	-	619
1983	9	-	21	88	125	26	269
<u>Rehabilitation</u>							
1967	0	-	0	0	33	-	33
1983	0	-	0	3	17	5	25
<u>Clearance</u>							
1967	0	-	0	0	1	-	1
1983	0	-	0	0	2	0	2

Source: Community Improvements Plan, 1967.  
Field Survey, 1983.

Future Housing Needs

Utilizing the population projections contained in the Demographic Analysis, it is possible to project the number of new housing units that will be needed in the Township to accommodate the new residents. The population projection to the year 2000 was a conservative one. Approximately 150 more persons are expected to be living within the Township by the turn of the century. The housing need will not, therefore, be substantial. The following table indicates that approximately 50-60 additional dwelling units will be necessary to house the new population by the year 2000. Hence, the average annual production need from 1984 on, would be only about three (3) units a year. This total could easily be reached even without the utilization of much new land; residential conversions and the expected fill-in of mobile home units at the Mobile Home Park could easily meet much of this housing need.

Table 23

Housing Need by Population & Household Size  
Lawrence Park Township 1980-2000

<u>Year/Projection</u>	<u>Average Household Size</u>			<u>New Population</u>
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Med.</u>	<u>High</u>	
	2.5	2.8	3.1	
1985/4,632	19	17	14	48
1990/4,682	20	18	16	50
1995/4,702	8	7	6	20
2000/4,731	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>29</u>
Total Unit Needs	59	52	45	147 (Persons)

---

Source: Consultant's calculations, 1983.

---

Determining total housing need on the basis of population projections, however, does not satisfy the needs of the Township in identifying the low income housing needs of the community. Therefore, the preceding housing needs projections should be looked upon as a goal that should be met, at a minimum by the private housing market.

The following statistics focus in on the needs of the low and low moderate income population of Lawrence Park Township:

- 615 persons were aged 65 years and older according to the 1980 Census.
- 297 persons were aged 60-64 years according to the 1980 Census.
- Both of these age groups have substantially increased during the past ten (10) years and are expected to continue to rise in number in the future.
- Of the 229 persons that were recorded as living in poverty status (via the 1980 Census), 31 were aged 65 years and older, 14 were in the age group 55-59, and 184 were under 55 years of age.
- Based upon the current 1983 U.S. HUD Section #8 housing assistance income limits, there are a total of 1,971 persons that form 699 households that are estimated to qualify for housing aid under low-moderate income status in the Township.
- 54% of all persons estimated to qualify for Section #8 assistance are currently considered to be of very low income status. This amounts to 1,077 persons that form 382 households.
- Through applying the 1980 Census percentages of non-elderly and elderly poverty level income groups against the recent U.S. HUD Section #8 low-moderate and very low income estimates, the following needs are provided: (1) There are 266 low to moderate income elderly persons of which about 144 persons are of very low income status and (2) 1,705 low to moderate income non-elderly income persons of which 933 persons are of very low income status. The current Section #8 income limits for Erie County are shown as follows:

<u>Income Classification</u>	<u>Income Limits by Number of Persons in Household</u>			
	<u>1 Person</u>	<u>2 Person</u>	<u>3 Person</u>	<u>4 Person</u>
Low-Moderate	\$14,000	\$16,000	\$18,000	\$20,000
Very Low	8,750	10,000	11,250	12,500
	<u>5 Person</u>	<u>6 Person</u>	<u>7 Person</u>	<u>8 Person</u>
Low-Moderate	\$21,250	\$22,500	\$23,750	\$25,000
Very Low	13,500	14,500	15,500	16,500

---

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Section#8  
Very Low and Low-Moderate Income Limits by County, 1983.

---

## HOUSING PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) While over 80% of the Township's housing stock is in sound condition and the survey of housing conditions indicated some improvement, the need for a basic housing code program to provide for the basic health and safety needs of shelter as well as preserve the aging housing stock should be implemented. A regional effort with nearby communities (Wesleyville and Harborcreek) would be worth exploring to provide administrative economies of scale, trained personnel and code conformity.
- (2) The Township should actively encourage the reparcelization and subdivision of the vacant land at the northwestern portion of the Township for single-family residential development. Currently, there are a few elongated strips of land running from behind the commercial frontage of East Lake Road to the Lake. These lands will most likely never be developed unless a single parcel can be created.
- (3) The Township should encourage residential apartment development as a secondary use in the Central Business District to provide more diversity for existing and future residents. Ground floors should still be utilized for business purposes only.
- (4) The future stability of single-family areas should be protected through limiting the conversion of single-family homes into two or more units to the areas shown as medium density on the Land Use Plan Map.
- (5) Additional mobile home park maintenance standards should be developed to ensure a quality park environment. In line with this, new industrial development abutting the mobile home park should be required to provide screening which segregates the two (2) land uses.
- (6) The low-income family housing needs should be met through utilizing existing Federal rent subsidy programs such as the Section #8 Program and support to the County Housing Authority efforts within northeastern Erie County.
- (7) The low-income elderly housing needs should be met through a direct publicly sponsored housing project. The Township should enlist the assistance of the Erie County Housing Authority to discuss the elderly housing needs, available sites, and available Federal and State housing programs with potential sponsors. Based upon the Section #8 low-income needs for Lawrence Park and surrounding area, it would appear that a 100 unit project is a most feasible short-term goal. Ideally, the project would be paired up with rental assistance via the Federal government to the benefit of the low-income elderly and the project sponsor. Optional programs are described in the Appendix.

The Planning Commission's first priority site is the old Priestly School Site, located on a block by itself between Priestly and Napier Avenues. This particular site has the advantage of already being publicly owned, it lies along a regular Erie Metropolitan Transit Authority bus line, it is adjacent to Four Mile Creek Park and lies within a good residential neighborhood that is within easy walking distance of the Township's Central Business District.

The Planning Commission's second priority site, located directly within the Central Business District, is the property currently held by the Keystone Service Station on Main Street and Smithson Avenue. This site holds similar locational assets and would directly fit into the Central Business District revitalization plans.

- (8) For the Township's long-term residential needs, a Planned Residential Development Ordinance should be developed. It should be adopted only if and when the Golf Course property ceases its operation as a recreation resource.
- (9) The Township should actively cooperate with the Erie County Redevelopment Authority and/or directly apply for State/Federal funds to develop a low-interest revolving loan fund for a low-moderate and low-income family rehabilitation program. This program would put the needed financial encouragement side by side with the enforcement end of the housing code program.

## TRANSPORTATION PLAN

A community's transportation system is one of its most important resources. The local road system should enable residents to move throughout the community and its adjacent surroundings safely and with ease and efficiency. The local road system is part of, and connected to, a regional highway system that provides contacts with "other regions" that supply goods and/or services to the Township. A workable and efficient transportation system is a major need of commerce and industry, both existing and potential.

The Transportation Plan is an integral component of the Comprehensive Plan. This Plan complements and supplements the Future Land Use Plan by providing the rationale and recommendations for improving the flow of traffic between various land use/development situations.

The Transportation Plan consists of three parts: (1) establishing a functional classification system to classify various local and State maintained roads according to the function(s) they should perform as well as the function(s) they actually perform; (2) an inventory of the local system and identification of problem areas; and, (3) to develop a listing of recommended improvements that should be made by the Township or State to minimize the potential for accidents and improve traffic flow.

As noted previously in the statement of Community Development Goals and Objectives, the basic goal of the Transportation Plan is to provide for the safe and convenient movement of goods and people within the community and to points beyond utilizing all methods practical.

### FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

The Federal and State governments maintain a classification system for all roads throughout the Commonwealth. This system is called the Federal Functional Classification System. Federal funding and in many cases State funding priorities for highways are allocated according to this system.

The functional classification system is also an aid to correlating the land use planning and thoroughfare (traffic) planning functions of the Comprehensive Plan. Proper recognition of the principal function that a highway, road, or street is intended to serve can reduce potential conflicts between land use activities and traffic movements. For example, from a theoretical or ideal standpoint, commercial and residential development should not be permitted or encouraged to indiscriminately locate along major arterial highways or roads. The opportunity for land use/traffic conflicts is obvious. The need for direct access to residential properties or commercial uses causes numerous left turn and crossover movements as well as ingress/egress movements, all of which slow and/or interrupt the smooth flow of traffic and, at the same time, substantially increase the potential for accidents to both pedestrians and vehicles.

The functional classification that has been developed for Lawrence Park Township is shown on the following chart and map. The classification system is discussed in the following paragraphs.

### Principal Arterial

This class of highways provides quick and efficient movement between major communities and/or provides direct access to major traffic generators such as shopping centers, large industries or recreation areas.

### Minor Arterial

This class of highway serves both traffic movement and land service with some emphasis placed on mobility. Minor arterials receive traffic from lesser streets as well as provide interconnection and support the major arterials. They generally connect the Township with immediately surrounding areas. East Lake Road is an example.

### Major Collector

This class of streets also serves a middling function, but places some emphasis on land access. Major collectors generally serve areas within the Township and constitute those streets on which travel distances are somewhat shorter than on the minor arterials, and also provide some interconnection to the larger highway network. There are no examples of a major collector in the Township.

### Minor Collector

This class of streets serves the internal movement of the highway network. This classification does not generally handle through trips, but supplies abutting property with access, while at the same time provides local traffic movement. Nagle Road and Lakeside/Lakecliff Loop are designated as minor collectors.

### Local

The primary function of this classification is to provide access to immediately adjacent land. These roads carry a small proportion of the vehicle miles of travel but make up a large percentage of the total street mileage within the Township. The local system offers the lowest degree of mobility and through traffic is usually deliberately discouraged.

Lawrence Park Township  
Designated Federal Highway  
Functional Classification System

<u>Designation</u>	<u>Roads</u>
Principal Arterial	Franklin Avenue
Minor Arterial	East Lake Road, Lawrence Parkway, Iroquois Avenue, and Main Street
Minor Collector	Nagle Road and the Lakeside/ Lakecliff Loop off of East Lake Road
Local	All other roads.

## AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC (ADT) COUNTS

The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) count is a system for expressing the number of vehicles which use roads on a daily average. The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation maintains a record of ADT volumes by means of portable automatic traffic counters and computer projections. The most recent ADT figures for the Township are included on the following table. Only state roads are calculated for the Township by PaDOT. As can be observed from the table, all but one (1) road has experienced increases in traffic volume during the 1967 to 1980 period.

Table 24

### Comparative Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Counts Lawrence Park Township


	<u>1967</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>#</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Change</u>
<u>East Lake Road</u>				
Nagle to Iroquois Avenue	6,700	7,700	1,000	15%
Iroquois to Lawrence Parkway	12,200	11,800	- 400	- 3%
Lawrence Parkway to Franklin Avenue	14,500	18,800	4,300	30%
<u>Iroquois Avenue</u>				
Nagle to Main Street	4,800	8,900	4,190	85%
Main to East Lake Road	4,300	6,100	1,800	42%
<u>Nagle Road</u>				
East Lake Road to Iroquois	500	950	450	90%
<u>Lawrence Parkway</u>				
Buffalo Road to Main Street	6,500	12,200	5,700	88%
Main to East Lake Road	3,400	8,500	5,100	150%
<u>Franklin Avenue</u>				
G.E. Entrance to East Lake Road	9,300	10,500	1,200	13%
G.E. Entrance to 12th Street	13,100	19,200	6,100	47%
<u>Main Street</u>				
Lawrence Parkway to Iroquois Avenue	3,900	4,300	400	10%

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation - District 1-0 Road Log Print-out for 1982 and Lawrence Park Community Improvements Plan of 1967 prepared by the Erie County Planning Department.


The increases in traffic volume have been most significant on Lawrence Parkway, Franklin Avenue, Iroquois Avenue and East Lake Road from Lawrence Parkway to Franklin Avenue. It must be noted that the major traffic generator in the

	Principal Arterial
	Minor Arterial
	Collector

~~5000~~ 1980 A.D.T.



**LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP**  
**ELIZABETH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**



Township--the G.E.--is primarily responsible for much of the change in ADT levels. The commercial development in nearby Harborcreek Township is also drawing new pass-through traffic that was not experienced in the late 1960's. Even though the State roads in the Township are well travelled, most roads are still well within the designated carrying capacity established by PaDOT. The following table shows the capacity and other characteristics of the existing highway system.

Table 25

Existing Highway System Data  
Lawrence Park Township

<u>Street/Segment</u>	<u>Widths</u>		<u>Capacity</u>	1980 ADT as
	<u>Cartway</u>	<u>R.O.W.</u>		<u>% of Capacity</u>
<u>East Lake Road</u>				
Nagle to Iroquois	24'	50'	19,000	41%
Iroquois to Lawrence Parkway	66'	100"	38,300	31%
Lawrence Parkway to Franklin	68'	120'	40,100	47%
<u>Iroquois Avenue</u>				
Nagle to Main Street	55'	120'	45,200	20%
Main to East Lake Road	55'	100'	45,200	13%
<u>Nagle Road</u>				
East Lake Road to Iroquois	18'	50'	14,600	7%
<u>Lawrence Parkway</u>				
Buffalo Road to Main	32'	50'	13,300	92%
Main to East Lake Road	24'	50'	9,500	89%
<u>Franklin Avenue</u>				
South end of viaduct to north end	28'	50'	10,100	N.A.
North end of viaduct to 12th St.	28'	95'	10,100	N.A.
12th St. to G.E. entrance	40'	100'	28,100	68%
G.E. entrance to East Lake Road	40'	100'	20,900	50%
<u>Main Street</u>				
Lawrence Parkway to Iroquois	56'	80'	13,500	32%

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation - Road Log Printout and calculations made therefrom by consultant.

From the above calculations, Lawrence Parkway exhibits the most immediate potential to reach or exceed its carrying capacity. Improvements in the short-range future are a high priority need, and will be explained in the next section.

Overall, it is felt that ADT levels for all other state and local roads in the Township will stay within the respective carrying capacity level to the year 2000. Ongoing structural maintenance and intersectional improvements will, however, be necessary.

#### TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations within this Plan are based upon (1) the Citizen's Survey of 1983, (2) past engineering reports, (3) County and State plans, and (4) an in-field survey of highway and intersection situations by the Consultant.

Following then, is a listing and basic discussion of the problems underlying each situation.

##### 1. Lawrence Parkway and East Lake Road

Traffic volumes have increased on both of these arterials at a healthy rate during the period of analysis and there is an obvious need to facilitate turning movements during peak hour traffic situations. The need for an improved right hand turn onto Lawrence Parkway from East Lake Road and improved right and left hand turns onto East Lake Road from the Parkway can be met through adding a new southbound right hand lane with increased turning radius on East Lake Road and a new northbound (also right hand) turn lane on the Parkway to East Lake Road.

##### 2. Lawrence Parkway and Main Street/G.E. Entrances

The presence of an entrance/exit to the G.E. parking lot on the west side of the intersection causes this intersection to experience turning problems during peak conditions. The left turn from the southern approach of the Parkway into the parking lot during peak conditions significantly reduces capacity since there is only one lane on this approach. In order to alleviate this situation, a new right hand turn lane is recommended to be implemented on the Parkway northbound to Main Street. This new lane would free the current one lane situation for left turn needs in peak situations.

##### 3. Nagle Road and East Lake Road

This "T" type intersection actually involves multi-turn access and egress situations to the Harborcreek Mall which is situated on the north side of East Lake Road. Traffic is currently controlled by only a stop sign which faces northbound Nagle Road traffic. Left hand westbound turns onto East Lake Road from Nagle Road are compounded by road grade and sight problems and both east and west, as well as straight across (to the Mall) traffic, are all jeopardized by high-speed traffic on East Lake Road. The need for overhead lighted traffic signalization to control the situation appears to be warranted. The actual type of signalization should be subject to traffic engineering study and the Township should request feasibility via PaDOT as soon as possible.

#### 4. Nagle Road/Rail R-O-W Reopening

In 1957, the Nagle Road crossing was closed by order of the Public Utilities Commission (P.U.C.) at the initiation of the New York Central Railroad (N.Y.C.R.R.). The closing of the crossing served to expedite the servicing of trains in the Lawrence Park yard by the N.Y.C.R.R. Since this time, however, the needs of the railroads involved are not the same and new development along both sides of Nagle Road and new regional shopping and recreational (YMCA/Tri-Community Pool) facilities have located along Routes 5 and 20 which demand a reconsideration of the closing by the P.U.C. In 1982, a study was prepared by the Township's Engineers (Urban Engineering, Inc.) which made the following conclusions:

- A. The crossing will provide a short, direct and safer 0.4 mile access for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians between a community now separated by railroad tracks and forced to use a two mile route for vehicles only with no provision for bicycle or pedestrians.
- B. The proposed crossing has the potential for conservation of 200,000 gallons of fuel and \$250,000 saving to community drivers annually excluding savings in tires, oil, time and hazard of 2,400,000 miles of travel and 80% less air pollution.
- C. The proximity of the proposed roadway at the crossing to the bicycle and pedestrian pathway, parallel to each other, provides safety by surveillance of the passing traffic. This eliminates the present hazardous dirt path around barricades and over unprotected tracks by day or night as at present.
- D. The crossing will restore a now needed road to a fully developed community. This alternate route to Buffalo Road will ease the peak hour traffic congestion on Water Street and speed its movement.
- E. The Nagle crossing will relieve the congestion at the Buffalo Road and Water Street intersection in Wesleyville.
- F. The crossing would provide an emergency route when the underpass of the Water Street route is flooded.
- G. The crossing provides access to 34 acres of Lawrence Park, now separated from its community by the tracks, for the residents and for fire and police protection. Also, it provides access to 20 acres, now isolated between Conrail and East Erie Commercial Railroad for future industrial development and better police surveillance, fire protection and community service.
- H. The crossing will provide a short convenient access for the Harborcreek and Lawrence Park residents north of the tracks to the business and recreation center south of the tracks, the shopping plazas, restaurants, YMCA, Tri-Community Pool. Also, residents south of the tracks will have direct access to the Harborcreek Mall and County Library, Medical Center and State Police. It will provide direct and more responsive access for the State Police to reach and serve the southern area.

Based upon the Nagle Road Study, it is recommended that Harborcreek and Lawrence Park Township and Wesleyville Borough make joint application to the P.U.C. for the reopening of the Nagle Road crossing for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. The crossing should be protected by railroad gates and lights. Other considerations which should be taken into account as a result of the opening include the need for curbing, storm sewers and sidewalks along both sides of Nagle Road from East Lake Road to Iroquois Avenue and traffic signalization controls at East Lake Road and Iroquois Avenue.

#### 5. Water Street Expressway

This expressway is a connecting arterial between the proposed Bayfront and Southern Tier highways and the existing Interstate 90 and it represents one of the major longer term plans of the Erie Area Transportation Study (EATS). Current plans for the expressway show the alignment of the road to approximately follow Lawrence Parkway in a refined curvilinear pattern. Plan schematics indicate that it will cross Buffalo Road about 600 feet to the east of its present intersection with Lawrence Parkway, proceed north across the railroad tracks on a raised viaduct, and proceed north on an alignment close to the current Parkway.

As a result of the local involvement in review of the plans for this major new highway, plans have been revised to provide for a link between Water Street and the residential section of Lawrence Park. The proposal shown on the Thoroughfare Plan would extend Field Street across Four Mile Creek and under the viaduct carrying the new highway, so that Field Street will tie into Water Street.

Detailed plans have also been prepared to improve traffic flow along East Lake Road from the Water Street Expressway eastward. The improvements include traffic islands to control turning movements at that intersection, and traffic through the intersection with Iroquois Avenue.

#### 6. East-West Light Rail Mass Transit

The longer term potential construction of the U.S. Steel Mill in western Erie County would cause numerous transportation needs. The prospects of providing light rail service along existing rail lines between the City of Erie and the new steel mill have been discussed as a means to combat potential east-west circulation needs and provide an alternative to auto travel. Should such service be initiated, it can and should be extended to Lawrence Park to provide an additional transportation facility to the General Electric work force. As such, a potential transit terminal location for such a facility is indicated in proximity to the east gate of the General Electric on the Transportation Plan map. The facility would also prove convenient to Lawrence Park residents by providing improved mass transit facilities to western Erie County.

#### 7. Bikeway Construction

An overall regional plan for bikeways has been developed by the Erie Area Transportation Study (EATS) Committee and the Township's engineers have developed detailed drawings for Lawrence Park Township's portion of the system along East Lake Road and Iroquois Avenue. The first phase of the system should get underway shortly, pending financial assistance from the State/Federal governments, and will consist of a Class I (off-road) facility using existing sidewalks, curb-cuts, marking and signing along the entire stretch of East Lake Road and Iroquois Avenue, where connections will be made to the City and Harborcreek systems along the same routes.

Subsequent to this first phase and the Nagle Road reopening, the Township should consider a north-south bikeway connecting East Lake Road to Buffalo Road along Nagle Road. Also, future consideration should be given to modifying the area-wide bikeway plan that calls for construction of a bikeway along the new Water Street Expressway. This should only be considered if full and complete auto-bike segregation is built into the project design. A better approach to providing this north-south bikeway would involve use of Napier Avenue and extension west from Field Street to the abandoned portion of Lawrence Parkway to Buffalo Road.

#### 8. Local Road Reconstruction

Due to present structural conditions, the following roads have been recommended for reconstruction within the short-range future:

- A. Bell Street (full length)
- B. Rankine Avenue (full length)
- C. Smithson Avenue (from Main Street to Bell Street)
- D. Newton Avenue (from Main Street to Napier Avenue)
- E. Napier Avenue (from Iroquois Avenue to Field Street)
- F. Frontenac Drive (full length)
- G. Joliette Avenue to Putnam Drive (on Dobbins Road)

The above projects should be prioritized locally, based upon actual road use, conditions and capital budgeting. Some of the work on the above roads will also require new curbing and drainage facilities.

#### 9. Lakecliff Drive/East Lake Road

In order to facilitate safe and convenient travel across the westbound lane of East Lake Road onto eastbound travel on East Lake Road, it is recommended that the median strip be reduced to provide a limited eastbound lane which would channelize into the current two (2) lane eastbound traffic flow. An example of this proposal is present at the current Harvey Avenue and East Lake Road intersection.

#### 10. Extension of Lakeside Drive

Should the property in the northwest portion of the Township be subdivided in the future, Lakeside Drive should be extended and connected into the City of Erie local street system at Euclid Avenue and Lakeside Drive. A southerly local connector with East Lake Road should be discouraged due to proximity with the Franklin Avenue and East Lake Road intersection and the existing commercial frontage along East Lake Road. An interior loop with two (2) tiers of lots is suggested as a potential subdivision layout. The extension of Cabot Avenue would be ideal. However, houses are now present and block access.

#### 11. Iroquois Avenue and East Lake Road Intersection Improvement

This intersection is burdened by a ninety (90) degree angle for traffic movement access to a very well travelled East Lake Road as well as cross turning movements onto Iroquois Avenue from East Lake Road. Also, the close proximity to Lawrence Parkway and current traffic lighting controls further compound the problem. As a high priority intersection improvement project, two (2) potential solutions should be considered. First and foremost, Township officials should request that the intersection undergo an ECONS cost-benefit analysis through the District 1-0 Office of the PaDOT and County Planning. Pending favorable findings of their analysis in the area of fuel savings and pollution control, improvements could be made to the current overhead traffic control lights to better direct traffic at this intersection. Secondly, consideration and follow-up traffic engineering analysis should focus on using the Township owned property at the point of Iroquois Avenue and East Lake Road, for a more direct (T type) connection to East Lake Road.

## IMPLEMENTATION

### Erie Area Transportation Study

The Erie Area Transportation Study (EATS) was initiated in 1963 through a cooperative agreement between Federal, State and local agencies. The study design is in accordance with guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Transportation for a continuing, comprehensive and coordinated transportation planning program in urbanized areas, as required by the 1962 Federal Highway Act. By satisfying these requirements, EATS assures the area continued Federal Aid for transportation improvements.

The study is carried on under the direction of Coordinating and Technical Committees which are composed of City, County, State and Federal officials. The Technical Committee oversees technical analysis and presents its findings to the Coordinating Committee with recommendations for action. The Coordinating Committee is the policy making body for the study, directs its overall program, and makes final decisions on plans and programs.

Representation on the highly influential Coordinating Committee is available to the officials of Lawrence Park Township as a voting member. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that the Township continue participation in EATS to promote the inclusion of needed highway improvement projects involving problem areas within the Township.

### Priority and Responsibility

The priority system utilized through the remainder of the transportation plan is based on the concept of practicality and feasibility. This concept produces the greatest improvements for the public investment in the shortest time. Consequently, the priority system includes three stages of implementation which are:

1. High Priority: From an immediate to a five year completion target date including relatively low investment recommendations to correct minor and/or long standing deficiencies in the present transportation system.
2. Medium Priority: From a five to ten (5 to 10) year completion target date including the higher investment safety deficiency and the least costly circulation recommendations.
3. Long Range: A completion target date span of from ten to twenty (10 to 20) years including necessary, but costly, circulation improvement recommendations.

With the above in view, the following project priorities and responsibilities are recommended:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responsibility/Funding</u>
(1) Lawrence Parkway and East Lake Road Intersection	High Priority	EATS/PaDOT
(2) Lawrence Parkway & Main Street	High Priority	EATS/PaDOT
(3) Nagle Road & East Lake Road Signalization	High Priority	EATS/PaDOT
(4) Nagle Road Reopening and Related Improvements	High Priority	P.U.C./Harborcreek, Lawrence Park & Wesleyville Borough
(5) Water Street Expressway	Long Range	EATS/PaDOT & U.S. DOT/UMTA
(6) East-West Light Rail	Long Range	EATS/PaDOT & U.S. DOT/UMTA
(7A) Iroquois Avenue Bikeways	High Priority	Lawrence Park & PaDOT
(7B) Nagle Road Bikeway	Medium Priority	Lawrence Park & PaDOT
(7C) Napier/Field/Lawrence Parkway Bikeway	Long Range	Lawrence Park & PaDOT
(8) Local Reconstruction and Repavement	To Be Determined	Lawrence Park & Liquid Fuels
(9) Lakecliff Drive/East Lake Road Median Strip Channel	Medium Priority	PaDOT
(10) Lakeside Drive Extension	Pending Subdivision Activity	Private
(11) Iroquois Avenue and East Lake Road Intersection	High Priority	PaDOT & Lawrence Park

All projects are identified on the accompanying Transportation Plan Map according to number.

☆ Transit terminal

## Signalization

## New construction

## Reconstruction project

## Bikeway

LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP

LINE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA



## COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

The Community Infrastructure Plan is the fourth and final component of the Comprehensive Plan. It includes analysis and recommendations for improving existing facilities as well as providing new facilities where necessary. The Plan is divided into five basic subsections: (1) education, (2) recreation, (3) public utilities, (4) municipal buildings, and (5) fire and police protection. Community infrastructure items are a most appropriate item for comprehensive planning as the health, safety, welfare and quality of life of the community's residents depend upon the various community systems and services provided. For the most part, these facilities are in place and meet high standards in Lawrence Park.

### EDUCATION

The Iroquois School District, which includes the neighboring community of Wesleyville, serves Lawrence Park. The School District presently operates three schools, two of which are in Lawrence Park. The largest is the Iroquois Junior-Senior High School located on a twenty-six acre site adjacent to Lawrence Park's business area. It is an excellent facility completed in the mid-sixties and having a field house and outdoor recreation facilities on the same site.

The District has two elementary schools. The Wesleyville School is the oldest of the structures and is handicapped by a relatively small site (2.3 acres) in a compactly developed area, but--as the only school located near Wesleyville children--it is being improved and will be retained.

The Lawrence Park Elementary School is sited across Iroquois Avenue from the Junior-Senior High on an attractive and centrally located tract of ten acres. This school, dating originally from 1924, has had several enlargements and renovations with the latest being in 1980.

Enrollments have been dropping in the School District and are projected to continue to decrease. Past trends and projections are summarized on the accompanying Table, and show a substantial decrease in all grades. The decrease results in part from the general reduction in the birth rate which has been a national phenomenon, and in part from the aging of the resident population. Even if a major change in the birth rate experience should occur, the smaller proportion of young families in the Iroquois District would result in a reduced student load.

Table 26

School Enrollment Trends  
Iroquois School District  
1964-1989

Year*	GRADES													SUB TOTALS				GRAND TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	
1964	188	165	174	175	161	142	146	152	146	159	141	162	126	702	449	457	429	2037
1969	169	173	155	156	174	169	174	187	202	174	170	177	176	653	517	563	523	2256
1974	162	131	149	156	126	150	166	168	132	204	187	195	195	569	442	504	577	2121
1979	134	134	111	111	136	131	119	139	140	144	150	161	150	490	386	423	461	1761
1984	92	116	108	113	67	120	128	103	105	134	128	116	132	429	345	342	376	1492
1989	110	112	114	112	110	92	116	108	113	97	120	128	103	448	318	318	351	1435

School Year Ending. SOURCE: Enrollments and Projections by Iroquois School District.

The Primary School is in excellent structural condition and considering its convenient location, this structure has already been scheduled and designed for reuse as an extended elderly care center. The School District's recent sale of this property included an additional small piece of property which included a portion of the football field necessitates a slight relocation of the field to the north. The rezoning decision to enable the renovation of the Primary School Building to the Extended Elderly Care Center was approved in 1983.

Since the Iroquois School District is the responsible agency for planning and implementing the educational needs of the Township, no attempt will be made herein to duplicate its efforts. There should, however, be a close level of coordination between the Township government and the School District in certain areas and as such, the following general planning recommendations are made:

- (1) All physical facility development plans of the School District should be reviewed by the Township Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners for coordination with the Township Comprehensive Plan.
- (2) Act 247, Section 305 requires that at least thirty (30) days prior to the execution of any relocation, demolition, removal or sale of any school district structure or land, that the school district must submit its proposed actions to the Township and County Planning Commission for review and recommendation.

- (3) The planning and programming of recreational facilities and services is an area which deserves close coordination between the District and Township. A certain percentage of School Board representation on the Township Recreation Commission should be maintained to provide for this ongoing need.
- (4) Problems relating to road conditions, intersection deficiencies, signing and signalization that are faced by the District's transportation system deserve high priority treatment and an open door to communication between the Township and School District must always be maintained.

## RECREATION

Lawrence Park holds within its name a promise that is well kept. One of the objectives of Lawrence Park is that no child should have to walk more than one-quarter mile to a playground. The park locations shown on the adjacent map show that the community is very close to meeting this objective. Parks are conveniently located to all residential districts, and are well improved with recreational equipment. Indeed, the only dwellings which do not enjoy walking access to a community park are those in the mobile home park south of the railroad; this can be solved with the opening of Nagle Road as explained in the Transportation Plan.

The park system along Four Mile Creek provides the most diverse and complete recreational facilities within the Township. The park itself serves as a buffer between the residential neighborhood and the General Electric Plant and utilizes and conserves the creek as a natural element interspersed within the developed area. Since this creek is also the area most prone to flooding in the community, its use for recreational purposes serves the public goal of protecting properties from natural hazard. The west side of the creek is used for a community playfield with baseball diamonds as the major use. The east side of the creek contains central playground facilities including play apparatus, shelters for picnicking and craft programs, and tennis courts. The park extends from East Lake Road south to the railroads, but most of the facilities are located north of Main Street. Bank erosion along the entire length of the recreational area has occurred during periods of heavy runoff and has damaged the playground area. Steps must be taken to stabilize the bank to prevent further damage to this facility. As of this writing, a funding application has been submitted and approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to implement this necessary project.

As was recommended in the Transportation Plan, the rerouting of the Bikeway from Lawrence Parkway to Napier Avenue on the east side of Four Mile Creek Park would further enhance the recreational use of the Park as well as provide safety due to the longer-range programmed Water Street Expressway.

An expansion of the Park along Four Mile Creek is possible on the former site of the first public school in Lawrence Park. This school sat on the small block surrounded by Napier, Priestley, Morse and Draper. The site is a little more than two acres in area and has been acquired by the Township from the School District. The site is level and wooded and is used for passive and creative recreation even though no improvements have yet been made to the site. Due to its ownership, location and past favorable comments by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Planning Commission considers that a portion of this site should be reserved for the Elderly Housing Project, as was discussed in the Housing Plan. Should this site be approved for such purposes, it is recommended that the western half of the block be retained as much as possible

in an undeveloped state for the passive recreation needs of the elderly and as a connecting buffer to Four Mile Creek Park.

The Lakeside Township Park is located in the center of the residential neighborhood north of East Lake Road. This park extends south from Lake Erie across Lakeside Drive and continues between Putnam Drive and Joliette Avenue to Dobbins Road. Playground apparatus and a tennis court are located in the southern portion of the park which centrally locates them to the area residents. Restructuring of this recreational area is necessary to eliminate overlapping usage for baseball and playground areas. The addition of a second tennis court is also desirable. The Township has a launching ramp on Lake Erie for use by residents. The ramp is made of concrete. However, it is in very poor condition and should be reconstructed. This park is centered on a drainage course which allows a more gentle grade for an approach to the Lake than is possible anywhere else in the Township other than Four Mile Creek. Since the Lake is an exceptional asset for the Township, every effort should be made to utilize it. This should include an expansion of the area adjacent to the Lake to include recreational facilities in addition to the reconstructed boat launching ramp.

In 1982 the Township, via a Coastal Zone Management grant, had its engineers develop an updated Design Study of the Lakeside Recreation Area. The final recommendations of this Study are shown in a phased approach on the two (2) accompanying plates. These plates were extracted from the Lakeside Feasibility and Design Study as prepared by Urban Engineers, Inc. in September 1982, and represent the Township's long-range plan for this park. A full explanation of the phased approach is included within the aforementioned study.

Elbow Tree Park, located on a block of its own (surrounded by Emmet Drive, Rankine Avenue, Smithson Avenue and Niagara Place) as well as the three (3) small triangular parks located along Iroquois Avenue are parks that should continue to be used for passive recreation use.

Finally, the School District provides numerous recreational facilities that complement the Township's program. There are recreational facilities located at the Junior-Senior High School. Playground equipment is located on the western edge of the school property, tennis courts on the eastern edge and three baseball fields along the southern boundary. There is a very active youth baseball program that utilizes these fields but there are no sanitary facilities at the present time. Provisions were made in the construction of the school bus garage to facilitate the addition of these facilities at a later date. The addition of these facilities in the near future should be considered. The High School area also contains a large "green" area between the school building and the athletic field. The usage of this area is severely hampered by a runoff creek that flows through the center of this area. This small creek should be tubed and the area leveled over to make it possible to better utilize this spot for recreational purposes.

Adjacent to the elementary school is another primary recreational area. This area includes a playground, two softball fields, a football field and an ice skating pond with a changing and warming building. The expansion of the playground to include a total play facility which develops physical fitness and creative development would give the Township a unique play facility which would be more creative,

safer and more beneficial to the children of the community than a conventional playground incorporating individual play apparatus. This is the best location for this facility as it is the most centrally located to the community and the elementary school. Joint planning and financing by the School District and Township is recommended for this improvement.

#### UTILITIES

The current network of public utilities is shown on the accompanying map. Unlike most communities in Erie County, Lawrence Park is totally served by public water and sewer service. No on-lot systems are necessary. Private extensions to the two (2) development opportunity tracts (the Golf Course and the northwest section of the Township) can be made off of existing major distribution lines on East Lake Road.


Both water and sanitary sewers are extensions of the City of Erie's systems. Improvements to the Township's system will be limited to the replacement of old water mains and the addition of new lines to complete loops which will ensure even pressure for increased fire protection. The Township's Engineers have identified a number of existing six (6) inch water line deadends which need to be converted into loops to provide better pressure. The City plans to improve water service to the area by the installation of a twenty-four inch main along East Lake Road into Harborcreek Township, and by a thirty inch line along Buffalo Road.

Minor problems occur in the sanitary sewerage system and this is a dual result of the age of the sewer lines and needs created by additional development outside of the Township. The most immediate problem that the Township must solve is founded within a 290 foot section of fifteen (15) inch sewer pipe, immediately north of Wesleyville Borough on Lawrence Parkway. A recent television camera inspection revealed sections of pipe that were missing, crushed and cracked with some badly off-set joints throughout this span. As this sewer line is the only transmission line carrying Wesleyville sewage to the City of Erie's Wastewater Treatment Plant, the project is a joint priority. A project funding application has been submitted by both municipalities to the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce for a Community Facilities (Harness Racing Bill) grant to match local funds to implement the renovation of this line. The Township's Engineers have identified the eventual replacement of the remaining 15 inch line along Lawrence Parkway to be an upcoming capital need of the Township.

The need to construct a new and continuous twelve (12) inch sewer interceptor line along Iroquois Avenue, from Main Street to East Lake Road, to improve collection in the southern portion of the Township has also been identified as a long-range need by the Township Engineers. Other project needs of a long-range nature include the construction of a new lift station at East Lake Road and Iroquois Avenue with the addition and update of existing pumping facilities.

The use of a television camera inspection program (as was used along Lawrence Parkway) is recommended to be utilized for an update program on the eight (8) inch lines which serve the majority of the local system.

**GREEN COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**



	15" Sewerage outfall line
	8"-15" Sewerage trunk line
	24" Sewerage interceptor
	12" Water main
	Sewerage lift station
	15"-24" Storm drainage line
	Active landfill
	Inactive landfill
	6" Natural gas transmission line
	10" Natural gas distribution line
	Private industrial gas well
	Abandoned gas well

## MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS

The governmental offices of Lawrence Park Township are housed in a converted dwelling on Silliman Street between Iroquois and Main. The structure is inadequate and does not meet acceptable safety standards for a public building. It is located on a parcel containing three lots. The structure must also provide offices for the police as well as other Township purposes. The space is inadequate for these needs. There is no space for meetings of the Commissioners and other boards. An unmanned post office is located on the same site, and is convenient to the residents of the Township.

A fire station owned by the Township is sited across the street from the Township Building on the northeast corner of Main and Silliman. In addition to providing for the garaging of fire fighting equipment, the structure provides meeting rooms for the firemen. This space, in the absence of adequate room in the Township Building, also provides for meetings of the Township Boards.

As this situation is far from ideal, the plan calls for the construction of a new Township Building on the northwest corner of Main and Silliman. The structure would occupy a site presently utilized by a gas station. The site abuts the three lots already owned by the Township so that ample parking can be provided, serving the needs of the post office, the volunteer firemen and the business district in addition to those of the police and Township administration.

A structure of approximately 6,000 square feet should be ample for the needs of the Township. The new Township Building is also intended to provide an important element in the revitalization of the business district. Its central location, open space, landscaping, off-street parking facilities, and--most importantly--its indication of community commitment to an improved Lawrence Park should combine to stimulate other investment to help revitalize the central business district.

## PROTECTION

The Township of Lawrence Park is fortunate to have a very active and committed Volunteer Fire Company. This observation is also shared by the community as the recent opinion survey of the Planning Commission found that approximately 91% of all respondents had rated fire protection as either good or excellent in the Township.

The Volunteer Fire Company currently (1983) consists of about 30 volunteers from the Township. A reciprocal assist relationship with the nearby volunteer companies of Wesleyville, Fairfield, Harborcreek and Brookside is in place to provide for additional firefighting capacity as needed. The Volunteers have been very active as of late in fire prevention education programming and this has spanned the schools to the business community.

The Company has recently solicited bids for its major capital needs, i.e. a 1500 gallon per minute pumper/tanker. This major rolling stock addition will be added to the existing equipment and no further additions are felt to be necessary in the short-range future.

The major problem facing the fire company is the settling of fire hydrants throughout the community which can in emergency situations hamper or make it nearly impossible to hook up hosing without on-the-spot (and timely) excavating. As such, it is recommended that an early action program be undertaken by the Township to correct this most serious safety problem.

Police protection in the Township is provided by a small Township force and it should be noted that the State Police Barracks is also housed within the Township. Local law enforcement constitutes an area of municipal services vital to every citizen. Municipalities must be prepared to provide a range and level of police service that will make citizens feel secure in their homes and communities.

The primary purpose of a police department is to provide a service to its community that ensures preservation of peace, the protection of life and property against attacks by criminals, and protection against injury by the careless and inadvertent offender.

If a police department is to maintain its effectiveness or achieve a level of acceptable effectiveness, it must be able to meet certain standards. Accompanying this section is a check list for evaluating police capabilities, services rendered and supportive services. This check list was derived from a 1974 study conducted by the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs.

It is suggested that Lawrence Park officials and the Police Department utilize the check list to determine the Department's overall effectiveness. If they are not satisfied with the results of their evaluation, then it is suggested that both groups undertake the necessary corrective actions to eliminate areas of concern or deficiency. Finally, it should be noted that the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs' (DCA) Bureau of Local Government Services provides a police management technical assistance program for communities interested in receiving outside recommendations. Should the Commissioners be interested, their requests should be made through the Erie Regional Office of the DCA.

# Police Service Evaluation Checklist

This checklist was prepared to aid local officials in evaluating their present police services in light of standards expressed by professionals in the law enforcement field, municipal officials, and the public.

Local law enforcement constitutes an area of municipal services vital to every citizen. Municipalities must be prepared to provide a range and level of police services that will make citizens feel secure in their homes and communities. For a police department to maintain operational effectiveness it must be able to meet the following standards; if it cannot, there is a serious deficiency in the service it provides. The methods outlined in the article should then be utilized to improve the police department's service.

## Grade

## Points

### Municipal Police Standards (Capabilities)

- |     |       |  |
|-----|-------|--|
| (1) | _____ | 1.) Provide 24-hour coverage for police services.  |
| (1) | _____ | 2.) Potential for back-up support for police officers on duty.   |
| (1) | _____ | 3.) Provide preventive patrols to minimize crime, traffic accidents, violations of the law.  |
| (1) | _____ | 4.) Professionally staffed communications system.  |
| (1) | _____ | 5.) Capability for continuous communication with adjacent law enforcement agencies.  |
| (1) | _____ | 6.) Effective communication with the public to keep them informed of procedures by which the police may be called for assistance during emergencies. |
| (1) | _____ | 7.) An efficient records system.   |
| (1) | _____ | 8.) Cooperative police community relations programs.   |
| (1) | _____ | 9.) Capability to plan for a variety of emergencies such as civil disorders, riots, and major disasters.   |
| (1) | _____ | 10.) Efficient use of available resources to keep costs at reasonable levels.  |

### Municipal Police Standards (Services Rendered)

- |     |       |   |
|-----|-------|---|
| (1) | _____ | 11.) Arrest of persons who violate the various federal, state, and local laws; the service of summonses and citations instead of arrest; and the giving of warnings instead of summonses and citations. |
| (1) | _____ | 12.) Obtain evidence lawfully; protect, gather and preliminarily process evidence at the scene of a crime; and forward evidence to a crime laboratory for analysis.                                     |
| (1) | _____ | 13.) Investigate complaints from the public; conduct preliminary and continuing investigations; and receive assistance from state and federal agencies when necessary.                                  |
| (1) | _____ | 14.) Interview complainants and witnesses professionally with regard for civil rights of prisoners/suspects.  |
| (1) | _____ | 15.) Selectively enforce juvenile laws; operate within department guidelines when it is necessary to interview, warn, or refer a child to a representative of the juvenile court.                       |
| (1) | _____ | 16.) Appear as a witness in court; cooperate with the district attorney, coroner, parole or probation officer or other court officials.   |
| (1) | _____ | 17.) Enforce traffic laws; direct traffic; investigate traffic accidents; give traffic information, and test for the influence of alcohol or drugs.   |
| (1) | _____ | 18.) Provide temporary custody and detention for all prisoners in accordance with special requirements for women and juveniles.   |
| (1) | _____ | 19.) Restrain criminals and those of unsound mind with use of only necessary force.   |
| (1) | _____ | 20.) Attempt to settle all disputes peacefully, taking legal action as a last resort.   |
| (1) | _____ | 21.) Prevent street disorders from becoming riotous conditions through prompt police action.  |

### Municipal Police Standards (Supportive Services)

- |     |       |   |
|-----|-------|---|
| (1) | _____ | 22.) Assistance to persons who are mentally ill.  |
| (1) | _____ | 23.) Give first aid to those who are injured in traffic or other accidents.   |
| (1) | _____ | 24.) Coordinate emergency action in a variety of circumstances relating to dangerous conditions.  |
| (1) | _____ | 25.) Maintain liaison with community agencies capable of providing assistance to persons who need medical or financial help.  |
| (1) | _____ | 26.) Protect minors found living under circumstances indicating that they are in danger of abuse or neglect; notifying parents, guardians, appropriate child welfare or religious agencies. |

## Rating — Accumulated Grade Points

Excellent — 23 to 26      Good — 20 to 22      Fair — 17 to 19      Poor — 0 to 16

## IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of the Lawrence Park Township Plan will require concerted action by many agencies, groups and officials. The purpose of this section is to provide an overall summary of the major projects, programs and opportunities as well as identify the means through which they can be implemented.

### LAND USE CONTROLS

The majority of the land use recommendations can be implemented without major cost to the Township through updating and preparing new land use controls. The update of the Township's Zoning Ordinance to put the Land Use Plan in motion should be the first priority of the Township. The adoption of a Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and a Planned Residential Ordinance should also be pursued in the short-range future (within five years) with priority given to the Subdivision Ordinance first, as small scale developments are more apt to occur during this period.

While the Township Planning Commission is fairly familiar with the Zoning and Subdivision tools, it should not underestimate the longer range importance of the Planned Residential Development Ordinance should the Golf Course cease its operations and development pressures increase.

The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Act 247) provides the enabling legislation for local governments to enact Planned Residential Development (PRD) Ordinances, which combine elements of both the zoning and the subdivision and land development ordinances into a more flexible and innovative design approach. The purposes for adopting a PRD ordinance include:

- a. To meet the growing demand for all housing types.
- b. To add design flexibility.
- c. To encourage innovations in residential development.
- d. To encourage a more efficient use of land and public services.
- e. To provide a procedure which can relate the type, design, and layout of the development to the site.

Basically, PRD regulations establish certain overall standards for density, water supply, sewage disposal, percentage of open space, and so on. The developer is permitted considerable flexibility within these established criteria, given the approval of PRD plans by the electorate. PRD is, however, only an option which is available to the developer meeting certain criteria.

Properly designed and administered, a PRD can benefit both the developer and the municipality. The PRD generally permits the developer to increase his overall density in return for a percentage of total land used for and devoted to common open space. The developer benefits by having increased design flexibility and fewer roads and utility lines. The municipality benefits by a centralization of service areas, less maintenance, more beneficial use of developable land area, and the reservation of common open space.

## CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT REVITALIZATION

As stated in the Central Business District Plan and the Community Development Goals and Objectives, the revitalization of the Central Business District is the major land use element. The necessity of a joint public and private program is most apparent. The Central Business District Plan offered general recommendations and alternatives to meet the revitalization objective. Specifics should, however, be worked out by the Township and as such it is highly recommended that an overall Central Business District design and cost feasibility study be prepared, with the participation of the local business community, in the immediate future. As suggested in the Plan, DCA planning monies should be pursued for this project. The assistance of the County Planning Department staff and/or a professional grantsman is warranted for application purposes. However, a proven economic development specialist with hands-on CBD experience should be procured to develop the final plan.

The details of the LERTA Ordinance should also be firmed up by the Township within the short-range future and this will require communication with the County Board of Assessment and the School District.

Finally, the Appendix includes several land use related Federal/State grant programs that should be pursued during the implementation stage.

## HOUSING CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Instituting a conservation program to preserve Lawrence Park's housing stock is an essential element of the Housing Plan. Recognizing that the majority of the Township's housing stock is in sound condition means that conservation practices are the foundation of the Housing Plan. Priority should be given to Neighborhoods 4, 5 and 6, since most of these areas meet the following criteria which constitutes a conservation program.

- (A) Time - The length of time the present land use pattern should continue in an area is an essential criteria in determining whether it should receive a high or low priority for treatment utilizing housing law enforcement to maintain minimum standards and protect general health and safety. Since all of the present residential neighborhoods are proposed to continue as residential areas, a conservation program is essential to conserve/preserve the existing sound structures and ensure the rehabilitation/removal of substandard structures to prevent the spread of blight.
- (B) Condition and Type of Structures - If the structures in the area are in such a dilapidated condition that they are not worth saving, then the area does not warrant conservation action. Obviously, this is not the case in Lawrence Park as the overwhelming majority of its housing is sound.

- (C) Use - The use designated by the community comprehensive plan or as dictated by strong community factors may determine whether particular structures should be preserved. Since this comprehensive plan basically proposes the continuation of the Township's present residential areas, there is no doubt that existing, sound residential structures should be preserved.
- (D) Land Coverage - If the structures are so large and so placed upon their lots as to create a density that exceeds acceptable standards, conservation would only tend to preserve this undesirable density. While there are some isolated situations where such conditions exist, it is expected that the Township can effectively deal with these situations on a case-by-case basis to minimize future problems as well as control further density increases via zoning.

In order to implement a meaningful and effective housing conservation program, an overall code enforcement program will eventually be required. A housing code is the legal tool for ensuring that residential structures meet basic health and safety standards to serve not only the welfare of the occupant, but also, adjoining property owners and the community at large. A Code Enforcement Program need not be so comprehensive in scope that it becomes an overwhelming administrative and compliance nightmare.

Another important component of any conservation program is financial in nature. One barrier to code compliance is generally the fear of property reassessment, due to the present tax structure. As such, property tax valuations should not be increased upon completion of work done specifically to meet code standards. In line with this policy, the municipality seeking to enforce codes successfully should publicly advertise a list of improvements which would not result in any increased assessment. Another method which could be utilized in a conservation effort is a tax credit as an incentive to encourage owners of homes to bring them up to housing code standards. For example, a tax credit of 10% on repairs up to \$3,000 per dwelling could be granted for a period of 2 or 3 years if the work was accomplished within that period. The specific parameters of this program would be determined by the Township depending upon what it estimates it can afford in discounted tax receipts. In making this decision, local officials should consider that for every \$1,000 of credit, \$10,000 worth of improvements will have been made, contributing a great deal to the overall housing quality.

Conservation and code enforcement must also be tempered with the knowledge that low income and elderly live in some of the units which do not meet minimum standards. They either cannot afford to do the necessary repairs themselves or they cannot afford the higher rents which would often accompany repair. For this reason, housing code enforcement must be coupled with some form of assistance when dealing with these cases. As such, governmental rehabilitation financial programs should be used in combination with code enforcement.

Considering the current state of flux, uncertainty and potential funding reductions within Federal housing assistance programs, one option to consider in meeting the financial needs of the low income and elderly within the Township is the development of a locally subsidized housing "rehab" program. The program would be ideally sponsored at the County level for all communities, with the administrative and technical support of the County Redevelopment Authority. Under such a program, the Township would create a special housing "rehab" fund and at the same time arrange for a line of credit at a cooperating bank. By pre-arranged agreement the Township would be

permitted to make loans to qualified home owners by drawing from its line of credit. A portion of the "rehab" fund would then be used to discount the interest on the homeowners loan.

It is probable that the Township could induce the cooperating bank to authorize loans at below-market rates. While the homeowner would be the ultimate recipient of the loan, the loan would actually be made to the Township. Thus, the interest earned by the bank would be tax-free, and therein lies the inducement of the bank to cooperate in the program. As a further inducement to encourage homeowner's participation in the "rehab" loan program, the municipality would subsidize a portion of the already below-market rate--say one or two percent--and that subsidy (differential) would be paid to the bank in a lump sum immediately upon the execution of the loan to the homeowner. As a service to the Township and the loan recipient, the cooperating bank would service the loan papers; however, the homeowner would remain responsible to the municipality.

One other option that could be used immediately, while the previous items are being worked out and coordinated, involves the use of voluntary improvements. "Clean-up, Fix-up and Paint-up" campaigns can be effective methods of initiating voluntary improvement programs and frequently many owners make an honest attempt to equal or better the requirements established by a community. However, the problem lies with those owners who cannot afford to make the recommended or required improvements or refuse to do so. The only solution in this instance involves the implementation of all or part of the preceding conservation program.

#### HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

As indicated in the Housing Plan, there is a strong desire and need to provide for housing for the elderly in the Township. The implementation of this project will require a sponsor; whether the sponsor is public, non-profit or private will be determined by the availability of grant and/or loan money under one or more of the housing programs listed in the Appendix.

While elderly need was determined in the Housing Plan, based upon current Federal housing assistance standards, it is recommended that the Township once again survey the needs of its elderly to determine real world demand. Secondly, the Township should communicate with various Federal housing program managers and private developers to explain its elderly housing needs and potential sites listed in the Housing Plan. Coordination should also be made with the Erie County Housing Authority, for potential direct public sponsorship and/or technical assistance in dealing with the State and Federal bureaucracy in identifying other project funding packages.

#### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMMING

In order to implement the identified capital projects listed as Township responsibilities under the Transportation, Housing and Infrastructure Plans, capital improvements programming is strongly recommended.

The objective of capital improvement programming (CIP) is threefold: (1) Identify all capital spending projects (new building and new equipment, road paving, parks improvements, etc.) by scope and cost, (2) determine priorities in line with realistic needs, and (3) budget the priorities within the framework of available finances. The CIP process should cover a period of no more than six (6) years and should be updated annually. The CIP process is essentially a framework for evaluation and use of the Township Commissioners. It should provide a basis for the capital programming decisions of the Township. Based upon the updated results of the CIP process an annual capital budget should be prepared at the same time as the general operating budget. Capital improvement programming also aids in the following:

- (1) To assist government in presenting a comprehensive picture of capital projects for which public funding is needed.
- (2) To assure that projects are well thought out preceding construction.
- (3) To assure that projects will be discharged in order of their predetermined priority and to plan in advance for the funding required.
- (4) To help in the coordination of projects to avoid waste and duplication of effort.
- (5) To permit better use of State and Federal funding.
- (6) To protect the Township from undue influence of special interest groups in pet projects.
- (7) To aid in encouraging a balanced, predetermined order of development, thus avoiding impetuous actions.

#### REGIONAL COOPERATION

Lawrence Park has recently joined together with several other communities to discuss potential joint roles and relationships. In Pennsylvania, there are three (3) main approaches to intergovernmental cooperation: the agreement, the joint authority, and voluntary councils of government. Examples of past regional cooperation in eastern Erie County is limited. However, the tri-party authority between Lawrence Park, Harborcreek, and Wesleyville, that led to the construction of the swimming pool complex at the suburban YMCA site is a good example of what can be accomplished when there is a common goal.

Various subject areas that can and should be considered as potential regional roles for Lawrence Park Township include code enforcement, ordinance administration, refuse collection and disposal, police protection, grantsmanship activities, and joint purchasing. The form and substance of regional cooperation should be determined by Township officials in the immediate future so that new and more cost-effective regional approaches may be implemented. Technical assistance in forming the most ideal intergovernmental agreement can be made available through the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs' Bureau of Local Government Services.

APPENDIX

to the

LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

APPENDIX A COASTAL ZONE POLICY FRAMEWORK AND  
SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

APPENDIX B FEDERAL AND STATE ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX C 1980 CENSUS STATISTICS

APPENDIX D OPINION SURVEY AND RESPONSES

COASTAL ZONE POLICY FRAMEWORK

I. COASTAL HAZARD AREAS

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to require municipalities with bluff recession hazard areas along the Lake Erie Shoreline as determined in the "Shoreline Erosion and Flooding - Erie County" report of 1975 to enact setback ordinances affecting stationary structures. These ordinances will regulate construction within a specified distance from the edge of the bluff.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to regulate, through permit, the siting of any water obstruction or encroachments along Lake Erie, to assure proper planning, design, construction, maintenance and monitoring, in order to prevent unreasonable interference with water flow (which includes sediment laden beach enriching littoral currents) and the protect navigation.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to assist Erie County and affected coastal municipalities in the preparation (individually or jointly on a watershed basis) of stormwater management plans and in the implementation of the plans by assisting them in adopting or amending codes, regulations, and ordinances to regulate development in such a manner as to mitigate the adverse impacts to Lake Erie bluffs due to increased rates of stormwater runoff.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to provide technical assistance and advice concerning the design of structural and nonstructural methods for shore protection and bluff stabilization.

In addition, it is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to continue to support scientific research on shore protection, recession rates, littoral transport and other aspects of the coastal environment of Lake Erie.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program acting through the Department of Environmental Resrouces and in concert with the Department of Community Affairs to actively assist and to help ensure that identified flood prone coastal municipalities develop state approved floodplain management regulations that incorporate at a minimum the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and the requirements of the State Floodplain Management Act. In addition, it is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to regulate the construction of or substantial improvement to various types of structures and obstructions in the designated floodplains in order to:

- (i) encourage planning and development in floodplains which are consistent with sound land use practices; (ii) protect people and property in floodplains from the dangers and damage of floodwaters and from materials carried by such floodwaters; (iii) prevent and eliminate urban and rural blight which results from the damages of flooding; (iv) implement a comprehensive and coordinated program of floodplain management, based upon the National Flood Insurance Program, designed to preserve and restore the efficiency and carrying capacity of the streams and floodplains of the Commonwealth; (v) assist municipalities in qualifying for the National Flood Insurance Program; (vi) provide for and encourage local administration and management of floodplains; and (vii) minimize the expenditure of public and private funds for flood control projects and for relief, rescue and recovery efforts.

Furthermore, it is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to assist local municipalities in the amelioration of periodic flooding due to increased surface runoff from areas adjacent to the floodway by encouraging the development, on a watershed basis, of comprehensive stormwater management plans that prevent increased rates of runoff.

## II. DREDGING AND SPOIL DISPOSAL

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to ensure that dredging and spoil disposal and related activities including the recovery of commercially valuable sand and gravel in the coastal zones will be regulated to protect against obstruction to navigation, reductions in flood flow capacity, and damages to the public interest, as well as minimize harmful impacts to fish and wildlife habitats.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to recommend that hydraulic dredging be used instead of mechanical dredging, whenever feasible.

## III. FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to ensure that, to the extent of intrastate control, that coastal waters shall not contain substances attributable to point or nonpoint source waste discharges in concentration or amounts sufficient to be inimical or harmful to the water uses to be protected or to human, animal, plant or aquatic life including cold-water fish, warm-water fish, or migratory fish.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to manage the Commonwealth's coastal waters in such a manner as to augment native stocks and introduce appropriate species, only after careful evaluation, such as muskellunge in the Delaware Estuary and salmonids in Lake Erie in order to provide diverse, unique, and bountiful catches for the Commonwealth's coastal fishermen.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to improve access to the Delaware Estuary and the Lake Erie waterfronts through the acquisition of new sites and/or the expansion of existing sites.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to undertake detailed technical studies of coastal fisheries, their aquatic habitats and associated issues that impact their management.

## IV. WETLANDS

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to preserve, protect and, where possible, enhance or restore the remaining tidal and freshwater wetlands within the Commonwealth's coastal areas by regulating through permit: draining, dredging, filling, and other activities that affect water quality course, current or cross section of any water course, floodway or body of water. This includes regulated activities in or otherwise affecting any important wetland. This will ensure the consideration of the wetlands' public values

such as: areas of fish and wildlife habitat, including endangered species as identified in the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, storage areas for flood waters, buffers against shoreline erosion, and water purification areas.

Furthermore, it is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to protect wetlands from cumulative impacts associated with increased runoff from development and other activities occurring in adjacent areas by encouraging the development of comprehensive stormwater management plans, that regulate surface runoff and the resultant introduction of sediment, pesticides, salts, and toxic materials into wetlands.

#### V. PUBLIC ACCESS FOR RECREATION

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to provide additional public access opportunities along the waterfronts of Lake Erie and the Delaware River for active recreation such as swimming, fishing, and boat launching, as well as for more passive activities such as sightseeing and picnicking.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to give high priority to acquisition and/or development of GAPC's, nominated as areas of significant natural value, and areas of historical, cultural or recreational significance, to provide public access opportunities for active and/or passive forms of recreation.

#### VI. HISTORIC SITES AND STRUCTURES

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to assist the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in the identification, restoration, and preservation of archaeologically, architecturally and historically significant sites and structures in the Commonwealth's coastal zones.

#### VII. PORT ACTIVITIES

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to actively attract and encourage the siting of port dependent economic activities in the Commonwealth's coastal ports.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to utilize its fiscal and other pertinent resources to support long-range, comprehensive planning for the future development and growth of the Port of Erie and the Pennsylvania Ports of the Delaware Estuary, which encourages the attraction, enhancement, and development of water dependent economic activities.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to utilize fiscal and other available management resources to: encourage the enhancement of current viable economic activities, encourage the attraction of new economic activities which adapt to the areas' changing needs, and encourage improvements in the areas' infrastructure to provide a strong economic base for the urbanized sections of the Commonwealth's coastal zones.

#### VIII. ENERGY FACILITY SITING

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to ensure through regulations, by permit, that energy facilities such as oil and gas refineries, electric generating stations (coal, hydro, oil and gas), electric generating substations, gas drilling, and liquification of natural gas operations locating in the coastal areas are sited in such a manner that the coastal areas ecosystems are not unreasonably adversely affected.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to facilitate the production of natural gas supplies in Lake Erie using proper environmental safeguards that are designed to minimize adverse air and water quality impacts associated with resource exploration and development.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to utilize Coastal Zone Management funds and provide other pertinent assistance, to encourage coastal municipalities to amend their comprehensive plans to reflect the recommendations contained in the energy facility siting planning process developed by the Coastal Zone Management Program, which among other things recommends that whenever feasible, new energy facilities are located adjacent to existing ones.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to support the development of outer continental shelf oil and gas resources through all available means, provided that the necessary environmental safeguards are enforced through regulation by the appropriate federal and state agencies to ensure that the integrity of the adjacent fish and wildlife habitat is not irreparably damaged due to drilling and other development activities.

#### IX. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to initiate a program of "State Consistency" to ensure that all state administrative departments and independent administrative boards and commissions and other state agencies shall enforce and act consistently with the enforceable policies of the Pennsylvania Coastal Zone Management Program.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to adopt by reference, the requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act (P.L. 95-217, as amended) and to incorporate these requirements into the Commonwealth's Coastal Zone Management Program.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to adopt by reference, the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act and to incorporate these requirements into the Commonwealth's Coastal Zone Management Program.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to periodically initiate, coordinate, and participate in comprehensive studies aimed at improving the regulatory permitting process in the Commonwealth's coastal zones.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to embrace the concepts set forth by "choices" and to promote the policy objectives and policies of "choices" in the Commonwealth's coastal zones; to the extent permitted by the Coastal Zone Management Program's coordinative mechanisms and implementation resources.

#### Choices for Pennsylvanians Objectives

- 1.0 To permanently strengthen Pennsylvania's economic base through innovation and modernization.
- 2.0 To promote the birth and expansion of innovative small businesses.
- 3.0 To make Pennsylvania a better place to do business.
- 4.0 To more effectively match people with jobs.
- 5.0 To revitalize Pennsylvania's urban and rural centers.
- 6.0 To strengthen intergovernmental partnerships for planning and implementing sound development strategies.
- 7.0 To utilize natural resources in a manner which conserves energy and protects the environment.

#### X. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to ensure that all meetings, where formal action is to be taken, be open to the public, preceded by public notice and held in reasonably accessible locations.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to provide citizens, special interest groups, and all other segments of the public with opportunities for early and continuous involvement and participation in the Commonwealth's Coastal Zone Management Program, through the development of effective communication and participation measures.

It is the policy of the Coastal Zone Management Program to establish a Coastal Zone Advisory Committee whose purpose will be to: provide a forum from which to address state and local coordination on coastal issues, periodically review the Coastal Zone Management Program with respect to public responsiveness and meeting the needs of the Commonwealth, and to advise the Environmental Quality Board on regulations affecting coastal resources.

## SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

The National Coastal Zone Management Act, while noting the importance of the entire coastal zone, declares that certain areas are of greater significance. As a requirement for program approval, the Act requires "an inventory and designation of areas of particular concern within the coastal zone".

There are two types of Geographic Areas of Particular Concern (GAPC's) identified for the Lake Erie coastal zone. These are Designated GAPC and Nominated GAPC. High and low priorities of use for both types of GAPC have been recommended by the Coastal Zone Management Program.

### Designated GAPC

Designated GAPC within Lawrence Park Township and the guidelines on priorities of use are as follows:

The Bluff Hazard Recession Area along Lake Erie is managed by the authority of the Bluff Recession and Setback Act. This area is a natural value area which has an even greater than normal degree of sensitivity caused by the bluff recession problem. Highest priority uses are to protect the natural values of the bluffs by requiring a minimum setback distance for all structures built within bluff recession hazard areas. The results will prevent and eliminate urban and rural blight which results from the damages from bluff recession, and protect people and property in bluff areas from the damages of bluff recession. Low priority uses are any activities that would disrupt the natural dynamics in a way that would lead to increased bluff recession rates.

Coastal floodplains are managed under the authority of the Floodplain Management Act and the Clean Streams Law. These areas are managed in a manner that enhances or maintains their natural function of handling flood flow. High priority uses are recreational or development activities, which meet the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and the State Act, and does not adversely impact the area's function as a floodplain. Low priority uses are any uses which would exacerbate flooding by impacting the area's natural function as a floodplain. Bluff recession leads to a loss of public investment as a result of flooding.

### Nominated GAPC

Nominated GAPC are those areas which the public, State, and Federal agencies, interest groups, and other affected parties identified as deserving special management attention during implementation of the Pennsylvania Coastal Zone Management Program. Priorities of use in Nominated GAPC are not binding because the State does not control them through direct ownership or regulation of specified resource areas such as bluff hazard areas, coastal floodplains and coastal wetlands.

There are no Nominated GAPC within Lawrence Park Township.

## APPENDIX B

### FEDERAL AND STATE ASSISTANCE

The following appendix includes a listing and general description of available Federal and State grant and loan programs that may be potential sources to implement the community development and housing recommendations of the Plan.

In the listing of housing programs, it should be noted that some of the specific interest rates and terms have changed since the original printing. However, the basic purpose, eligibility and subsidy explanations are still current. Also, the funding allocations for each program are subject to annual change.

In the area of public housing, the two (2) major funding sources are the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Federal Housing Administration and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration. In order to develop low or moderate income subsidized housing in a community, an eligible sponsor from within the public or private sector must be utilized. Under the Housing Authorities Law of 1937 (P.L. 955) as amended, the State enacted the necessary legislation for cities and counties to create public housing authorities. For Lawrence Park, the Erie County Housing Authority is the appropriate public sponsor.

Another organization that provides funds for housing is the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency. This Agency was created by the Housing Finance Agency Law of 1959 (P.L. 1688) as amended, with the similar objective of providing appropriately priced housing for low and moderate income families and individuals. It seeks to accomplish this by the use of mortgage loans financed through the sale of tax exempt bonds. The tax exempt status of the bonds permits a reduced interest rate on them; and therefore, a lower interest rate on the mortgages financed through the bonds. Both public and private sponsors can be used under the PHFA Program.

THE SMALL COMMUNITIES PROGRAM  
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Pennsylvania's Small Communities Program (SCP) has been designed to provide assistance that helps to promote decent housing and a suitable living environment within eligible communities. It is also intended to provide for expanding economic development opportunities.

Federal law requires that SCP funded activities give maximum feasible priority towards meeting one or more of the following objectives:

- To principally benefit low- to moderate-income persons and families;
- To aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight; and
- To eliminate urgent existing conditions which pose a serious or imminent threat to the health and welfare of the community (HOWEVER: SCP funds may be used for this last objective only when a community can document that no other financial resources are available to meet such needs).

Pennsylvania's Small Communities Program has incorporated these three Federal statutory objectives in its design aimed primarily at community conservation and economic development. To achieve these two aims, the SCP contains six program objectives as a further refinement of the Federal objectives:

1. To assist Pennsylvania communities in their efforts to meet the needs of their low- to moderate-income residents.
2. To assist Pennsylvania communities in their efforts to eliminate or lessen local blight.
3. To encourage and assist Pennsylvania communities to pursue economic development activities through public/private investment initiatives and the creation of new jobs.
4. To stimulate and assist Pennsylvania communities to undertake needed commercial revitalization efforts through public/private investment initiatives and the creation of new jobs.
5. To assist Pennsylvania communities in undertaking community facilities improvements vital to the health, safety and welfare of their residents.
6. To assist Pennsylvania communities in addressing necessary housing

ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

SCP applications may be submitted only for the purposes and activities defined below:

- (1) the acquisition of real property (including air rights, water rights, and other interests therein) which is (A) blighted, deteriorated, deteriorating, undeveloped, or inappropriately developed from the standpoint of sound community development and growth; (B) appropriate for rehabilitation or conservation activities; (C) appropriate for the

preservation or restoration of historic sites, the beautification of urban land, the conservation of open spaces, natural resources, and scenic areas, the provision of recreational opportunities, or the guidance of urban development; (D) to be used for the provision of public works, facilities, and improvements eligible for assistance under this title; or (E) to be used for other public purposes;

(2) the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or installation (including design features and improvements with respect to such construction, reconstruction, or installation which promote energy efficiency) of public works, facilities and site or other improvements -- including neighborhood facilities using renewable resource energy system), streets, street lights, water and sewer facilities, foundations and platforms for air rights sites, pedestrian malls and walkways, and parks, playgrounds, and recreation facilities (including parks, playgrounds, and recreation facilities established as a result of reclamation and other construction activities carried out in connection with a river and land adjacent thereto where assistance under other Federal laws or programs is determined to be unavailable), flood and drainage facilities in cases where assistance for such facilities under other Federal laws or programs is determined to be unavailable and parking facilities, solid waste disposal facilities which are located in or which serve designated community development areas;

(3) code enforcement in deteriorated or deteriorating areas in which such enforcement, together with public improvements and services to be provided, may be expected to arrest the decline of the area;

(4) clearance, demolition, removal, and rehabilitation (including rehabilitation which promotes energy efficiency) of buildings and improvements (including interim assistance, and financing public or private acquisition for rehabilitation, and rehabilitation, of privately owned properties and including the renovation of closed school buildings);

(5) special projects directed to the removal of material and architectural barriers which restrict the mobility and accessibility of elderly and handicapped persons;

(6) payments to housing owners for losses of rental income incurred in holding for temporary periods housing units to be utilized for the relocation of individuals and families displaced by activities under this title;

(7) disposition (through sale, lease, donation, or otherwise) of any real property acquired pursuant to this title or its retention for public purposes;

(8) provisions of public services, including but not limited to those concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, energy conservation, welfare or recreation needs, if such services have not been provided by the unit of general local government (through funds raised by such unit, or received by such unit from the State in which it is located) during any part of the twelve-month period

immediately preceding the date of submission of the statement with respect to which funds are to be made available under this title, and which are to be used for such services, unless the Secretary finds that the discontinuation of such services was the result of events not within the control of the unit of general local government, except that not more than 10 per centum of the amount of any assistance to a unit of general local government under this title may be used for activities under this paragraph;

(9) payment of the non-Federal share required in connection with a Federal grant-in-aid program undertaken as part of activities assisted under this title;

(10) payment of the cost of completing a project funded under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949;

(11) relocation payments and assistance for displaced individuals, families, businesses, organizations, and farm operations, when determined by the grantee to be appropriate;

(12) activities necessary (A) to develop a comprehensive community development plan, and (B) to develop a policy-planning management capacity so that the recipient of assistance under this title may more rationally and effectively (i) determine its needs, (ii) set long-term goals and short-term objectives, (iii) devise programs and activities to meet these goals and objectives, (iv) evaluate the progress of such programs in accomplishing these goals and objectives, and (v) carry out management, coordination, and monitoring of activities necessary for effective planning implementation;

(13) payment of reasonable administrative costs and carrying charges related to the planning and execution of community development and housing activities, including the provision of information and resources to residents of areas in which community development and housing activities are to be concentrated with respect to the planning and execution of such activities and including the carrying out of activities as described in section 701(e) of the Housing Act of 1954 on the date prior to the date of enactment of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1981;

(14) activities which are carried out by public or private nonprofit entities, including (A) acquisition of real property; (B) acquisition, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or installation of (i) public facilities, site improvements, and utilities, and (ii) commercial or industrial buildings or structures and other commercial or industrial real property improvements; and (C) planning;

(15) grants to neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations, local development corporations, or entities organized under section 301(d) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to carry out a neighborhood revitalization or community economic development or energy conservation project in furtherance of the objectives of section 101(c);

(16) activities necessary to the development of comprehensive community-wide energy use strategy, which may include items such as --

(A) a description of energy use and projected demand by sector, by fuel type, and by geographic area;

(B) an analysis of the options available to the community to conserve scarce fuels and encourage use of renewable energy resources;

(C) an analysis of the manner in, and the extent to, which the community's neighborhood revitalization, housing, and economic development strategies will support its energy conservation strategy;

(D) an analysis of the manner in, and the extent to, which energy conservation objectives will be integrated into local government operations, purchasing and service delivery, capital improvements budgeting, land use planning and zoning, and traffic control, parking, and public transportation functions;

(E) a statement of the actions the community will take to foster energy conservation and the use of renewable energy resources in the private sector, including the enactment and enforcement of local codes and ordinances to encourage or mandate energy conservation or use of renewable energy resources, financial and other assistance to be provided (principally for the benefit of low- and moderate-income persons) to make energy conserving improvements to residential structures, and any other proposed energy conservation activities;

(F) appropriate provisions for energy emergencies;

(G) identification of the local governmental unit responsible for administering the energy use strategy;

(H) provision of a schedule for implementation of each element in the strategy; and

(I) a projection of the savings in scarce fossil fuel consumption and the development and use of renewable energy resources that will result from implementation of the energy use strategy; and

(17) provision of assistance to private, for-profit entities, when the assistance is necessary or appropriate to carry out an economic development project.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM  
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
BUREAU OF HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT

The Housing Assistance program, administered by DCA's Bureau of Housing and Development, is authorized under the Housing and Redevelopment Assistance Law of 1955 as amended. The Section of the Law that governs the Housing Assistance program provides for state assistance to contribute to the development of low and moderate income housing. Projects assisted with State funds are tied to HUD or FmHA housing programs. The aids available to sponsors are:

- (1) Direct Grants - provided to sponsors who demonstrate that the housing project would be financially infeasible without state assistance. Grants are limited to 10% of the projects total development costs.
- (2) Seed Money Loans - provided to cover costs associated with pre-development expenses necessary to obtain federal subsidy funding. The loans are repaid when construction begins. Pre-development costs may include items such as land options, legal fees, test borings and application fees to the federal agency.

Eligible Applicants

There are three types of eligible applicants for State Housing Assistance funds:

- (1) a private nonprofit corporation
- (2) governmental agencies
- (3) authorities

In recent years the General Assembly has appropriated \$16 million for both the Housing and Redevelopment Assistance programs. Commitments for program funds are made by each DCA Regional Office to eligible projects in their area. Applications for state funds are channeled through both the Housing and Development Divisions for funding decisions.

Application Procedures

- (1) Eligible applicants may submit a letter of intent to the appropriate DCA Regional Office. It is recommended that the letters be submitted prior to the start of the State Fiscal Year, July 1. (However, applications may be submitted throughout the program year).
- (2) Proposals are invited and reviewed by DCA Regional Office Staff and recommended to the Central Bureau for approval/disapproval.
- (3) Final funding approval is determined by the DCA Executive Office.

GUIDE TO FARMER'S HOME ADMINISTRATION HOUSING PROGRAMS

TYPE	HOMEOWNERSHIP LOAN (Section 502)	HOMEOWNERSHIP GUARANTEED LOAN (Section 502)
PURPOSE	<p>To buy, build, rehabilitate, improve, or relocate a house which will be the residence of an eligible family.</p> <p>To install water and waste disposal on a building site.</p>	<p>To buy, build, rehabilitate, improve, or relocate a house which will be the residence of an eligible family.</p> <p>Loans are made by private lenders and guaranteed by FmHA.</p>
INTEREST RATE	<p align="center">11 1/2% (as low as 1% with subsidy)</p>	<p>Interest rate will be negotiated between family and lender. It cannot exceed the interest being charged in area for other similar loans.</p>
LOAN TERM	<p>Maximum loan term is 33 years. On an existing house, term will be less.</p>	<p>Maximum loan term is 33 years. On an existing house, term will be less.</p>
SUBSIDY	<p>Families (or individuals) with adjusted annual incomes below \$11,200 may be eligible for <u>interest credit</u> (subsidy). Subsidy will reduce the monthly payment to 20% of family's adjusted monthly income or payment to principal, interest at 1%, taxes, insurance--whichever is higher.</p>	<p>No subsidy is available under this program.</p>
ELIGIBILITY	<p>Families (or individuals) who want to be homeowners and do not already own standard housing and have adjusted annual incomes below \$15,600.</p> <p>Must have enough income to repay the loan; be unable to get other affordable financing; and be citizens or legal aliens.</p>	<p>Families (or individuals) who do not already own standard housing and have adjusted annual incomes between \$15,600 and \$ 30,000</p> <p>Must have enough income to repay the loan; be unable to get other affordable financing; be citizens or legal aliens; be able to make downpayment of at least 3% of the cost of house.</p>
LIMITATIONS	<p>There is no mortgage limit. Each loan is based on the applicant's ability to repay. House cannot be larger than 1300 square feet of living area (except for very large families)</p>	<p>There is no mortgage limit. Each family's loan amount will be based on ability to repay. House cannot be larger than 1400 square feet of living area (except for very large families).</p>

FmHA PROGRAMS

TYPE	HOME REHABILITATION LOAN (Section 502 Incentive)	HOME REPAIR LOAN AND GRANT (Section 504)
PURPOSE	To rehabilitate or repair a home to bring the structure to a structurally sound and functionally adequate condition. Can include adding rooms and plumbing.	To make minor repairs to homes to make them safe and sanitary and to remove hazards to the family or community. Funds can be used for repairing roofs, screens, structural items, putting in plumbing, and paying utility connection fees.
INTEREST RATE	Interest rate varies. See subsidy section below for breakdown.	1 %
LOAN TERM	\$2500 loan - 10 years \$2501 - \$5000 15 years \$5001 - \$7000 25 years	\$1500 loan - 10 years \$1501 - \$2500 15 years \$2501 - \$5000 20 years
SUBSIDY	Interest rate is based on family's adjusted annual income:  1% - if income is \$3000 or less  2% - if income between \$3001 and \$5000  3% - if income between \$5001 and \$7000	All loans are made at 1%.  Elderly families eligible for grants
ELIGIBILITY	Low income families (or individuals) who own structurally sound homes which need repair or rehabilitation. Family must: have enough income to repay loan; be unable to get other financing on affordable terms; be citizens or legal aliens.	Very low income families (or individuals) who own their own homes. Must have enough dependable income to repay the loan and must be citizen or legal alien.  Applicants who are 62 or over may be eligible for grant or combination loan and grant.
LIMITATIONS	No family may receive more than \$7000 at one time.	No family may receive more than \$5000 in grants or \$7500 in loans.  Funds cannot be used simply to improve a house's appearance.

FmHA PROGRAMS

TYPE	FARM LABOR HOUSING LOAN AND GRANT (Section 514/516)	RURAL RENTAL HOUSING (Section 515)
PURPOSE	To buy, build, repair, or improve housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor.	To build, rehabilitate, improve, or buy rental housing for rural families or individuals.
INTEREST RATE	1%	10 3/4%
LOAN TERM	33 years	Up to 50 years
SUBSIDY	The rent to the tenant is lowered by reducing development costs through combination of the 514 loan and the 516 grant. This reduces the loan amount to as little as 10% of development cost.	Interest rate can be subsidized down to as low as 1%, depending on type of borrower and loan option selected. Tenants can be further subsidized in some projects with FmHA's Rental Assistance Program or with Section 8, permitting them to pay about 25% of their adjusted income for rent.
ELIGIBILITY	Tenants: Farm laborers and their families are to be given highest priority. Borrowers: Farm owners, associations of farmers, nonprofit organizations and housing authorities, unable to provide the housing through private financing. Only nonprofit organizations and housing authorities are eligible for grants.	Tenants: depends on the type of project, i.e., subsidized or unsubsidized. Borrowers: Individuals, partnerships, profit, nonprofit, and limited profit operations, housing authorities. Only nonprofits and limited profits are eligible for interest subsidies.
LIMITATIONS	No maximum mortgage amount	No limit on total but over \$1.5 million must be approved by National Office.

FmHA PROGRAMS

TYPE	SITE DEVELOPMENT LOAN/TA GRANT FOR SELF HELP HOUSING (Section 523)	SITE DEVELOPMENT LOAN (Section 524)
PURPOSE	<p>Loan: to buy a tract of land and develop it as building sites for self-help housing. Could include engineering, subdivision, installing streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, utilities.</p> <p>Grant: to hire a qualified person to supervise a nonprofit association of self-help families</p>	<p>To buy a tract of land and develop it as building sites. Work could include engineering, subdivision, installing streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, water, sewer, electricity, and gas as required by FmHA and the municipality.</p>
INTEREST RATE	3%	10 3/4%
LOAN TERM	2 years	2 years
SUBSIDY	All loans are subsidized to 3%	None
ELIGIBILITY	<p>Borrowers: nonprofit associations of families engaged in development of self-help housing, or housing authorities on behalf of such families</p> <p>Families: 502-eligible families with low income interested in building their home through self-help method</p> <p>The mortgages on the individual homes are provided by the Section 502 program.</p>	<p>Nonprofit corporations or housing authorities. Sites may be sold to any buyer, regardless of income.</p>
LIMITATIONS	<p>Loan amounts greater than \$100,000 require National Office approval.</p> <p>The supervisor provides technical assistance in construction, work allocation, and helps families secure 502 permanent financing. Grant amount for this person may vary.</p>	<p>Loans greater than \$100,000 require National Office approval.</p>

GUIDE TO HUD HOUSING PROGRAMS

TYPE	HOMEOWNERSHIP INSURED LOAN MIDDLE INCOME (Section 203(b))	HOMEOWNERSHIP INSURED LOAN LOW-TO-MODERATE INCOME (Section 235)
PURPOSE	Provides insurance for private lenders to provide loans to families to purchase new and existing homes.	Provides insurance for private lenders to provide loans to families to purchase new or rehabilitated homes.
INTEREST RATE	11 1/2%	Could be subsidized to as low as 4%
LOAN TERM	30 years maximum	30 years maximum
SUBSIDY	None	Homeowners pay 20% of adjusted income or the payment to principal, interest at 4%, insurance, mortgage insurance (.7% of Mortgage), and taxes--whichever is higher.
ELIGIBILITY	Family must have good credit rating and ability to repay.  Must be able to make a downpayment of 3% of the first \$25,000 and 5% of the amount over \$25,000.	Family must have an income of no greater than 95% of the area median (this varies from county to county)  Family must be able to make downpayment of 3% of the cost of the house.
LIMITATIONS	Maximum amount that can be borrowed is \$67,500, but can be increased 75% in high cost areas.	Maximum amount that can be borrowed is \$44,000.  Income is reviewed every year.

HUD PROGRAMS

TYPE	MOBILE HOME LOAN (Section 201)	HOME IMPROVEMENT LOAN (Section 201)
PURPOSE	Provides insurance for private lenders to provide loans to families to purchase new or used mobile homes.	Provides insurance for private lenders to provide loans to families to improve their homes and increase the basic livability or utility of the property, including mobile homes. Eligible work includes plumbing, structural items, wiring, energy conservation.
INTEREST RATE	16 1/2% for mobile homes 16 % for home/lot combinations	16 1/2%
LOAN TERM	15 years for single-wide 20 years for double-wide	15 years
SUBSIDY	none	none
ELIGIBILITY	Family must have acceptable credit rating and ability to repay.  Must have a downpayment of 5% of first \$6,000 and 10% of amount over \$6,000.	Family must have acceptable credit rating and ability to repay.
LIMITATIONS	Mobile home must be used for principal residence of the borrower. Maximum amount that can be borrowed is \$27,000 for a double-wide home; \$18,000 for single-wide.	Maximum amount that can be borrowed is \$15,000.

# HUD PROGRAMS

TYPE	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM (Rehab Loans/Grants)	HOME REHABILITATION LOAN (Section 312)
PURPOSE	Provides loan and/or grant funds for home rehabilitation to families who cannot afford to fix up their homes any other way.	Provides loans for home rehabilitation to families who cannot afford to fix up their homes through any other means.
INTEREST RATE	Depends on local program	3%
LOAN TERM	Depends on local program	20 years or 3/4 of remaining life of property, whichever is less.
SUBSIDY	Depends on local program	reduced interest rate
ELIGIBILITY	Depends on local program. Generally, eligible applicants will be low to moderate income families living in certain target neighborhoods selected by the city for upgrading.	Family must be owner-occupants living in certain neighborhoods designated by the city for upgrading
LIMITATIONS	Determined by the City.	Maximum amount than can be borrowed per family is \$27,000.

# HUD PROGRAMS

TYPE	RENTAL HOUSING INSURED LOAN MIDDLE INCOME (Section 207)	RENTAL HOUSING INSURED LOAN MODERATE INCOME (Section 221(d)(4))
PURPOSE	Provides insurance to private lenders to provide loans to build new rental housing.	Provides insurance for loans made by private lenders for building or buying and rehabilitating rental housing for moderate income families.
INTEREST RATE	13%	13%
LOAN TERM	40 years	40 years
SUBSIDY	none	none  (Section 8 New Construction Housing Assistance Payments may be piggy-backed with this program)
ELIGIBILITY	Any profit-motivated borrower with ability to repay loan.  No eligibility requirements for tenants.	Any private or public for-profit, non-profit, or limited profit entity.  No eligibility requirements for tenants.  Priority in occupancy is given to anyone displaced by government action.
LIMITATIONS	Loans must be for 8 or more units. Developers must contribute 10% of development cost. Nonelevator per unit limit: OBR-\$19,500; 1BR-\$21,600; 2BR-\$25,800; 3BR-\$31,800; 4+BR-\$36,000.	Nonelevator per unit limits: OBR-\$19,406; 1BR-\$22,028; 2BR-\$26,625; 3BR-\$33,420; 4+BR-\$37,870  Loan cannot be used to acquire existing project without intent of doing substantial rehabilitation.

# HUD PROGRAMS

TYPE	ELDERLY HOUSING INSURED LOAN (Section 231)	ELDERLY/HANDICAPPED HOUSING DIRECT LOAN (Section 202)
PURPOSE	Provides insurance to private lenders to make loans for construction or substantial rehabilitation of 8 or more units of detached, semi-detached, row, walk-up, or elevator type multi-family structures for the elderly and handicapped.	Provides financing for construction of new units for the elderly, disabled, or handicapped. Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments are automatically linked to the program.
INTEREST RATE	13%	The current average market interest rate on outstanding U.S. Treasury obligations.
LOAN TERM	40 years maximum	40 years
SUBSIDY	none (Section 8 New Construction Housing Assistance Payments may be piggy-backed with this program)	Section 8 New Construction housing assistance payments provide subsidies to eligible tenants.  Borrower gets below market interest rate on financing.
ELIGIBILITY	Any private or public for-profit, non-profit, or limited profit entity.  At least 50% of tenants must be elderly or handicapped.  No income limitations.	Borrower: nonprofit corporations and cooperatives are only eligible borrowers. Tenants: persons or families with a member who is 62 or over or is handicapped or disabled.  Income limits same as Section 8 limits.
LIMITATIONS	Nonelevator per unit limits: OBR-\$18,450; 1BR-\$20,625; 2BR-\$24,630.	Nonelevator per unit limits: OBR-\$19,000; 1BR-\$21,500; 2BR-\$25,000  Elevator: OBR-\$21,700; 1BR-\$24,900; 2BR-\$30,800

# HUD PROGRAMS

TYPE	LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING	HOUSING ASSISTANCE PAYMENT PROGRAM (Section 8)
PURPOSE	To build, rehabilitate, improve or buy rental housing for independent living for occupancy by low income families.	Provides housing assistance payments to owners of new, substantially rehabilitated, or existing housing on behalf of eligible tenant families.  This is a subsidy program, not a financing program.
INTEREST RATE	N/A	N/A
LOAN TERM	40 - 60 years	Existing: depends on lease New Construction: 20 to 40 years depending on financing method.
SUBSIDY	Family pays 25% of their adjusted monthly income for rent and utilities.  Operating subsidies are provided to housing authorities to make up difference between rent collected and operating costs.	Family pays 25% of net or 15% of gross income, whichever is higher, for rent and utilities. HUD pays difference between family's share of rent and contract rent. (Fair Market Rents for New Construction are higher than for Existing)
ELIGIBILITY	Borrower: Local Housing Authority Tenants: Must meet LHA's definition of family and have an income no greater than 72% of the area median. Income limits vary from community to community.	Owners can be private or public, profit or nonprofit. Eligible tenants are those with incomes of less than 80% of the area median.
LIMITATIONS	Local housing authorities have an asset limitation for admission and a preference rating. Families are taken in this order: displaced families, disabled or handicapped, elderly, veterans, other.	

PENNSYLVANIA INDUSTRIAL  
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
(P.I.D.A.)

ADVANTAGES

- Lowest interest rate currently available
- Loans are long term
- P.I.D.A. financing may be used in combination with other Local, State and Federal loan programs

USAGE

Can be used for:

- Purchase and renovate existing building
- Construct new buildings
- Land acquisition and preparation, including associated
- Engineering and legal fees
- Cannot be used for machinery and equipment

ELIGIBILITY

- Manufacturing
- Research and development
- Warehouse, distribution, terminal
- Industrial enterprises
- Facilities which create significant employment opportunities
- Pollution control projects
- One job should be created for every \$15,000 loaned
- Cannot be used for retail establishments, restaurants or recreational facilities

AMOUNT OF  
LOAN

- \$1,000,000 loan ceiling
- P.I.D.A. portion of loan cannot exceed 70% of cost and building for land

INTEREST  
RATE

- 3% (until April 1984)
- Application and closing fee

MATURITY

- P.I.D.A. portion cannot exceed 15 years or term of conventional loan, whichever is shorter

SPECIAL  
CONDITIONS

- Provides 70% of building cost
- Balance for land and buildings from lending institution at prevailing interest

GENERAL

- Construction financing required
- P.I.D.A. portion takes 6-12 months for loan closing
- For additional information regarding this particular funding program, contact the County Development Corporation or your local industrial development corporation

INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS  
AND MORTGAGE (IRB)

ADVANTAGES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Local financing and processing</li><li>• No costs incurred for registering bond with mortgage department</li></ul>
USAGE	<p>Can be used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All P.I.D.A. eligible items, <u>plus</u></li><li>• Machinery and equipment (only if used in conjunction with construction of new or additional facilities, improvements to existing space or initial occupancy of existing space)</li><li>• Cannot be used for working capital or inventory</li></ul>
ELIGIBILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Manufacturing</li><li>• Research and development</li><li>• Warehouse, distribution, terminal</li><li>• Pollution control equipment</li><li>• Financing may be used by qualified developer to construct industrial or commercial facilities for leasing</li><li>• Cannot be used for restaurants or recreation facilities</li><li>• <del>One job should be created for every \$15,000 loaned</del></li></ul>
AMOUNT OF LOAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can finance up to 100% of project cost</li><li>• \$10 million maximum capital investment, unless project involves UDAG or pollution control</li></ul>
INTEREST RATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interest rates pegged to prime (65-80% of prime)</li><li>• Application, closing and annual fees</li></ul>
MATURITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loan period cannot exceed useful life of asset</li></ul>
SPECIAL CONDITIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loan conditions vary and are determined by lending institutions</li></ul>
GENERAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Processing requires public hearing and approval by County Commissioners</li><li>• For additional information regarding this particular funding program, contact the County Development Corporation or your local industrial development corporation</li></ul>

## SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (SBA)

ADVANTAGES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Available to those unable to obtain funds from private sources</li><li>• Can be used for working capital</li></ul>
USAGE	<p>Can be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Construct, expand or convert facilities</li><li>• Purchase buildings, equipment or materials</li><li>• Working capital</li></ul>
ELIGIBILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any small business use including manufacturing, wholesale, service, retailing, construction and agriculture</li></ul>
AMOUNT OF LOAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Direct SBA loans -- \$150,000 maximum</li><li>• SBA bank guaranteed loans -- 90% of loan, or \$500,000 maximum, whichever is less</li></ul>
INTEREST RATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Direct SBA loans -- below prevailing market rates</li><li>• SBA bank guaranteed loans -- above prevailing market rates</li><li>• Application and closing fees</li></ul>
DURATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regular business loans -- 10 years</li><li>• Working capital loans -- 7 years</li><li>• Construction or real estate acquisition loans -- 20 years</li><li>• Economic opportunity loans -- 15 years</li><li>• Handicapped assistance loans -- 15 years</li><li>• Displaced business loans -- 30 years</li></ul>
SPECIAL CONDITIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Applicant must have applied to, and been rejected by, at least one lending institution</li><li>• May require personal guarantee of owner</li></ul>
GENERAL	<p>SBA offers two basic types of loans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Loans by private lenders and guaranteed by SBA. Funds appropriated by Congress. SBA can guarantee up to 90%.</li><li>2. Loans made direct by SBA. Also appropriated funds. Granted primarily to small firms having difficulty raising funds in private market.</li></ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For additional information regarding this particular funding program, contact the County Development Corporation or your local industrial development corporation</li></ul>

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (SBA)  
503 LOAN

ADVANTAGES

- Interest rates below conventional sources
- Most universally applicable loan program for job creating projects

USAGE

Can be used for:

- Land and building acquisition
- Construction
- Renovation or expansion
- Machinery and equipment
- Leasehold improvements
- Reasonable contingencies

ELIGIBILITY

- One job should be created or retained for every \$15,000 loaned
- For profit company whose net worth cannot exceed \$6,000,000 -- with after tax profits not more than \$2,000,000
- Industrial, commercial and retail projects eligible

AMOUNT OF LOAN

- Each loan can have different interest rate (usually 4-6% below conventional rates)
- Application and closing fees

MATURITY

- 15, 20, 25 years depending upon project

SPECIAL  
CONDITIONS

- Provides 40% of total need
- Private financing (can include IRB financing) 50%
- Applicant provides 10%
- SBA loan portion requires sale of bonds

GENERAL

- Federal fund disbursement upon project completion
- For additional information regarding this particular funding program, contact the County Development Corporation or your local industrial development corporation

NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA REGIONAL  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
REVOLVING LOAN FUND

ADVANTAGES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Funds can be obtained in 4-6 weeks</li><li>• Can be combined with any other loan, including P.I.D.A., IRB, etc.</li></ul>
USAGE	<p>Can be used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Building construction and/or renovation</li><li>• Machinery and equipment, including engineering costs</li><li>• Land acquisition and preparation including associated engineering and legal fees</li><li>• Working capital</li><li>• Interim loan in anticipation of permanent financing</li><li>• Energy related product development and energy construction projects</li></ul>
ELIGIBILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Small manufacturing</li><li>• Fewer than 20 employees</li></ul>
AMOUNT OF LOAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$50,000 maximum for any one project</li><li>• Applicant must provide minimum of 10% from own resources</li><li>• Loan cannot exceed 1/3 of project cost</li></ul>
INTEREST RATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interest rate based on 60% of prime (rounded to nearest 1/4%) on date of approval -- remains fixed throughout term of loan</li><li>• Application and closing fees</li></ul>
MATURITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land and buildings -- up to 20 years</li><li>• Machinery and equipment -- up to 10 years</li><li>• Working capital -- up to 5 years</li></ul>
SPECIAL CONDITIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All conditions set by Northeastern Pennsylvania Regional Planning and Development Commission</li></ul>
GENERAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Similar loan programs also offered by some communities</li><li>• Program subject to availability of funds</li><li>• For additional information regarding this particular funding program, contact the                      County Development Corporation or your local industrial development corporation</li></ul>

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
TITLE II, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
ADMINISTRATION, BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT LOANS

ADVANTAGES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Widest range of applicability</li></ul>
USAGE	<p>Can be used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land, building, machinery and equipment</li><li>• Working capital</li></ul>
ELIGIBILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Must be in EDA certified development area</li></ul>
AMOUNT OF LOAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No established minimums or maximums -- range from \$200,000 to \$5.2 million</li></ul>
INTEREST RATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Direct loans: Below prevailing market rates</li><li>• Guaranteed loans: Above prevailing market rates</li><li>• Application and closing fees</li></ul>
MATURITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Direct loans: Fixed assets -- up to 25 years</li><li>• Guaranteed loans: Fixed assets -- up to 25 years</li></ul>
SPECIAL CONDITIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provides 65% of total need</li><li>• Private financing 35%</li><li>• Applicant equity 10%</li></ul>
GENERAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project must be in an EDA-designated EDD or redevelopment area</li><li>• Requires extended processing time</li><li>• Dependent upon availability of funds</li><li>• For additional information regarding this particular funding program, contact the           County Development Corporation or your local industrial development corporation</li></ul>

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN  
DEVELOPMENT, URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION  
GRANTS (U.D.A.G.)

ADVANTAGES

- Low interest rate
- Loans are long term
- Funds can be used for broad range of projects

USAGE

Can be used for:

- Land, buildings, machinery and equipment
- Working capital

ELIGIBILITY

- Available only in eligible communities
- Community Development Office is first contact

AMOUNT OF LOAN

- Cannot exceed 1/4 of project costs
- No limit on total amount of project

INTEREST RATE

- Set by Federal government
- Generally below market rates

MATURITY

- Set by Federal government

SPECIAL  
CONDITIONS

- Federal grant program is extended to community
- Community in turn loans funds to developer

GENERAL

- Program is most often linked with IRB
- Requires extended processing time
- Dependent upon available funds
- For additional information regarding this particular funding program, contact the County Development Corporation or your local industrial development corporation

# APPENDIX C

## 1980 CENSUS OF POPULATION - CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS

LAKENEC PARK

GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: 6700  
TRACT: 0114 BLOCK: ED: UA:

1. PERSONS BY URBAN AND RURAL RESIDENCE 2. FAMILIES 1237 3. HOUSEHOLDS (1) 1584

TOTAL 4584 4. PERSONS BY SEX 5. MEDIAN AGE OF PERSONS BY SEX

INSIDE URBANIZED AREAS 2164 TOTAL  
OTHER URBAN 2020 MALE  
RURAL FEMALE

3A. PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD (7) 2.82

6. PERSONS BY RACE 7. PERSONS BY SPANISH ORIGIN 8. PERSONS BY SEX BY AGE

	WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN	ESKIMO	ALEUT	JAPANESE	CHINESE	FILIPINO	KOREAN	ASIAN INDIAN	VIETNAMESE	HAWAIIAN	GUAMANIAN	SAMOUAN	OTHER (3)	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE
NOT OF SPANISH ORIGIN	4561	3	4	2	5	5	1	14	13	14	13	14	13	14	13	4570	2164	2020
MEXICAN																7		
PUERTO RICAN																7		
CUBAN																		
OTHER SPANISH																		
9. PERSONS OF SPANISH ORIGIN BY RACE																		
TOTAL																		
WHITE																		
BLACK																		
AMERICAN INDIAN																		
ESKIMO																		
ALEUT																		
JAPANESE																		
CHINESE																		
FILIPINO																		
KOREAN																		
ASIAN INDIAN																		
VIETNAMESE																		
HAWAIIAN																		
GUAMANIAN																		
SAMOUAN																		
OTHER (3)																		

10. PERSONS BY AGE BY RACE

	UNDER 5 YEARS	5 TO 17 YEARS	18 TO 64 YEARS	65 YEARS AND OVER
TOTAL	283	981	2705	615
WHITE	281	972	2694	614
BLACK				
AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO AND ALEUT				
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER (4)				

11. PERSONS OF SPANISH ORIGIN BY AGE BY RACE

	UNDER 5 YEARS	5 TO 17 YEARS	18 TO 64 YEARS	65 YEARS AND OVER
TOTAL				
WHITE				
BLACK				

	UNDER 5 YEARS	5 TO 17 YEARS	18 TO 64 YEARS	65 YEARS AND OVER
TOTAL	437	1091	1092	104
WHITE	437	1091	1092	104
BLACK				

NOTES: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE.  
B. BLACK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

**LAWRENCE PANK**

1. TOTAL PERSONS	2. TOTAL FAMILIES	3. TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS (1)
4584	1237	1588

4. PERSONS 15 YEARS AND OVER BY SEX BY MARITAL STATUS

\*\*\*\*\*  
TOTAL AND OVER \*\*\*\*\*

	SEPARATED	MARRIED	EXCEPT SEPARATED AND MARRIED	FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS
1941	1041	1041	1041	1041
1942	1042	1042	1042	1042

NAME	AGE	RELATIVES (S)	RELATIVES (S)
1744	1001	1001	1001
1745	1001	1001	1001
1746	1001	1001	1001
1747	1001	1001	1001
1748	1001	1001	1001
1749	1001	1001	1001
1750	1001	1001	1001
1751	1001	1001	1001
1752	1001	1001	1001
1753	1001	1001	1001
1754	1001	1001	1001
1755	1001	1001	1001
1756	1001	1001	1001
1757	1001	1001	1001
1758	1001	1001	1001
1759	1001	1001	1001
1760	1001	1001	1001
1761	1001	1001	1001
1762	1001	1001	1001
1763	1001	1001	1001
1764	1001	1001	1001
1765	1001	1001	1001
1766	1001	1001	1001
1767	1001	1001	1001
1768	1001	1001	1001
1769	1001	1001	1001
1770	1001	1001	1001
1771	1001	1001	1001
1772	1001	1001	1001
1773	1001	1001	1001
1774	1001	1001	1001
1775	1001	1001	1001
1776	1001	1001	1001
1777	1001	1001	1001
1778	1001	1001	1001
1779	1001	1001	1001
1780	1001	1001	1001
1781	1001	1001	1001
1782	1001	1001	1001
1783	1001	1001	1001
1784	1001	1001	1001
1785	1001	1001	1001
1786	1001	1001	1001
1787	1001	1001	1001
1788	1001	1001	1001
1789	1001	1001	1001
1790	1001	1001	1001
1791	1001	1001	1001
1792	1001	1001	1001
1793	1001	1001	1001
1794	1001	1001	1001
1795	1001	1001	1001
1796	1001	1001	1001
1797	1001	1001	1001
1798	1001	1001	1001
1799	1001	1001	1001
1800	1001	1001	1001

6. HOUSEHOLDS BY PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD

127	215	FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER
-----	-----	--------------------

MALE HOUSEHOLDER	111	HOUSEHOLDER OR SPOUSE	1	IN GROUP QUANTILES:
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10	10
11	11	11	11	11
12	12	12	12	12
13	13	13	13	13
14	14	14	14	14
15	15	15	15	15
16	16	16	16	16
17	17	17	17	17
18	18	18	18	18
19	19	19	19	19
20	20	20	20	20
21	21	21	21	21
22	22	22	22	22
23	23	23	23	23
24	24	24	24	24
25	25	25	25	25
26	26	26	26	26
27	27	27	27	27
28	28	28	28	28
29	29	29	29	29
30	30	30	30	30
31	31	31	31	31
32	32	32	32	32
33	33	33	33	33
34	34	34	34	34
35	35	35	35	35
36	36	36	36	36
37	37	37	37	37
38	38	38	38	38
39	39	39	39	39
40	40	40	40	40
41	41	41	41	41
42	42	42	42	42
43	43	43	43	43
44	44	44	44	44
45	45	45	45	45
46	46	46	46	46
47	47	47	47	47
48	48	48	48	48
49	49	49	49	49
50	50	50	50	50
51	51	51	51	51
52	52	52	52	52
53	53	53	53	53
54	54	54	54	54
55	55	55	55	55
56	56	56	56	56
57	57	57	57	57
58	58	58	58	58
59	59	59	59	59
60	60	60	60	60
61	61	61	61	61
62	62	62	62	62
63	63	63	63	63
64	64	64	64	64
65	65	65	65	65
66	66	66	66	66
67	67	67	67	67
68	68	68	68	68
69	69	69	69	69
70	70	70	70	70
71	71	71	71	71
72	72	72	72	72
73	73	73	73	73
74	74	74	74	74
75	75	75	75	75
76	76	76	76	76
77	77	77	77	77
78	78	78	78	78
79	79	79	79	79
80	80	80	80	80
81	81	81	81	81
82	82	82	82	82
83	83	83	83	83
84	84	84	84	84
85	85	85	85	85
86	86	86	86	86
87	87	87		

	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
IN MARRIED-COUPLE FAMILY	1069	1087	2156
IN OTHER FAMILY	1043	1043	2086
OR SOME PERSONS	1037	1037	2074
WIDERN	1037	1037	2074

MALE HOUSEHOLDER	NO WIFE	OTHER RELATIVES (5)	OTHER RELATIVES (6)
19	19	63	63

NONFAMILY HOUSEHOLD  
IN GROUP QUARTERS  
5 TO 17 YEARS  
975

12	1	OTHER
FEMALE HOUSEHOLVER	12	1
11. HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE OR MORE	11	1

7. HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE OR MORE PERSONS  
I IV. HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE OR MORE PERSONS

CHARACTERISTIC	IN HOUSEHOLDS	IN HOUSEHOLDS AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE	AGE	PERCENT
SEPARATED COUPLE FAMILY	522	40 YEARS	45 YEARS	
MARRIED COUPLE FAMILY	522	40 YEARS	45 YEARS	

MALE HOUSEHOLDS, NO WIFE

NONFAMILY HOUSEHOLD      2   1   2 OR MORE PERSONS:      1   BLACK

13. SPANISH ORIGIN HOUSEHOLDS BY	14. HOUSEHOLD TYPE	15. SEX	16. AGE	17. RACE	18. LANGUAGE	19. EDUCATION	20. INCOME	21. CITIZENSHIP	22. NATIVITY	23. YEAR OF ENTRY	24. YEAR OF BIRTH	25. YEAR OF DEATH	26. YEAR OF MARRIAGE	27. YEAR OF DIVORCE	28. YEAR OF REMARRIAGE	29. YEAR OF SEPARATION	30. YEAR OF REENTRY	31. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	32. YEAR OF REENTRY	33. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	34. YEAR OF REENTRY	35. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	36. YEAR OF REENTRY	37. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	38. YEAR OF REENTRY	39. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	40. YEAR OF REENTRY	41. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	42. YEAR OF REENTRY	43. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	44. YEAR OF REENTRY	45. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	46. YEAR OF REENTRY	47. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	48. YEAR OF REENTRY	49. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	50. YEAR OF REENTRY	51. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	52. YEAR OF REENTRY	53. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	54. YEAR OF REENTRY	55. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	56. YEAR OF REENTRY	57. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	58. YEAR OF REENTRY	59. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	60. YEAR OF REENTRY	61. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	62. YEAR OF REENTRY	63. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	64. YEAR OF REENTRY	65. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	66. YEAR OF REENTRY	67. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	68. YEAR OF REENTRY	69. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	70. YEAR OF REENTRY	71. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	72. YEAR OF REENTRY	73. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	74. YEAR OF REENTRY	75. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	76. YEAR OF REENTRY	77. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	78. YEAR OF REENTRY	79. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	80. YEAR OF REENTRY	81. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	82. YEAR OF REENTRY	83. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	84. YEAR OF REENTRY	85. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	86. YEAR OF REENTRY	87. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	88. YEAR OF REENTRY	89. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	90. YEAR OF REENTRY	91. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	92. YEAR OF REENTRY	93. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	94. YEAR OF REENTRY	95. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	96. YEAR OF REENTRY	97. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	98. YEAR OF REENTRY	99. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	100. YEAR OF REENTRY
13. SPANISH ORIGIN HOUSEHOLDS BY	14. HOUSEHOLD TYPE	15. SEX	16. AGE	17. RACE	18. LANGUAGE	19. EDUCATION	20. INCOME	21. CITIZENSHIP	22. NATIVITY	23. YEAR OF ENTRY	24. YEAR OF BIRTH	25. YEAR OF DEATH	26. YEAR OF MARRIAGE	27. YEAR OF DIVORCE	28. YEAR OF REMARRIAGE	29. YEAR OF SEPARATION	30. YEAR OF REENTRY	31. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	32. YEAR OF REENTRY	33. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	34. YEAR OF REENTRY	35. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	36. YEAR OF REENTRY	37. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	38. YEAR OF REENTRY	39. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	40. YEAR OF REENTRY	41. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	42. YEAR OF REENTRY	43. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	44. YEAR OF REENTRY	45. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	46. YEAR OF REENTRY	47. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	48. YEAR OF REENTRY	49. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	50. YEAR OF REENTRY	51. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	52. YEAR OF REENTRY	53. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	54. YEAR OF REENTRY	55. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	56. YEAR OF REENTRY	57. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	58. YEAR OF REENTRY	59. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	60. YEAR OF REENTRY	61. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	62. YEAR OF REENTRY	63. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	64. YEAR OF REENTRY	65. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	66. YEAR OF REENTRY	67. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	68. YEAR OF REENTRY	69. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	70. YEAR OF REENTRY	71. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	72. YEAR OF REENTRY	73. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	74. YEAR OF REENTRY	75. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	76. YEAR OF REENTRY	77. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	78. YEAR OF REENTRY	79. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	80. YEAR OF REENTRY	81. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	82. YEAR OF REENTRY	83. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	84. YEAR OF REENTRY	85. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	86. YEAR OF REENTRY	87. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	88. YEAR OF REENTRY	89. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	90. YEAR OF REENTRY	91. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	92. YEAR OF REENTRY	93. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	94. YEAR OF REENTRY	95. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	96. YEAR OF REENTRY	97. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	98. YEAR OF REENTRY	99. YEAR OF DEPORTATION	100. YEAR OF REENTRY

[illegible]

TOTAL	4	15	PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD	BY	IF MORE (10)
TOTAL	OCCUPIED				

BLACK	1 PERSON	314	81	TOTAL
4482				

16. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH ONE OR	3 PERSONS	50
270	50	

NUMBER OF PERSONS PER ROOM	NUMBER OF PERSONS	NUMBER OF ROOMS
1	143	143
2	17	8
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	0	0
12	0	0
13	0	0
14	0	0
15	0	0
16	0	0
17	0	0
18	0	0
19	0	0
20	0	0
21	0	0
22	0	0
23	0	0
24	0	0
25	0	0
26	0	0
27	0	0
28	0	0
29	0	0
30	0	0
31	0	0
32	0	0
33	0	0
34	0	0
35	0	0
36	0	0
37	0	0
38	0	0
39	0	0
40	0	0
41	0	0
42	0	0
43	0	0
44	0	0
45	0	0
46	0	0
47	0	0
48	0	0
49	0	0
50	0	0
51	0	0
52	0	0
53	0	0
54	0	0
55	0	0
56	0	0
57	0	0
58	0	0
59	0	0
60	0	0
61	0	0
62	0	0
63	0	0
64	0	0
65	0	0
66	0	0
67	0	0
68	0	0
69	0	0
70	0	0
71	0	0
72	0	0
73	0	0
74	0	0
75	0	0
76	0	0
77	0	0
78	0	0
79	0	0
80	0	0
81	0	0
82	0	0
83	0	0
84	0	0
85	0	0
86	0	0
87	0	0
88	0	0
89	0	0
90	0	0
91	0	0
92	0	0
93	0	0
94	0	0
95	0	0
96	0	0
97	0	0
98	0	0
99	0	0
100	0	0

[illegible]

	UNDER 65 YEARS	46	1 +	MUSINGS, Q. 11 (7)	2.82	1-01 TO 1.50	19
~							

[illegible]

N. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

# 1980 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING - CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSING UNITS

LAWRENCE PARK

GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SP: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: 5700 TRACT: 0114 BLK: UA1 CU: 1625

1. TOTAL PERSONS 454 2. HOUSING UNITS (INCLUDING SEASONAL AND MIGRATORY UNITS) BY URBAN AND RURAL (2) 1627 1627 1588 37

4. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY ROOMS 9 5 33 150 320 1100 5.6 7. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE 1588 259

1 ROOM 5 ROOMS 3 ROOMS 4 ROOMS 5 ROOMS 6 OR MORE ROOMS MEDIAN ROOMS 1 2 TO 9 10 OR MORE MOBILE HOME OR TRAILER

8. VACANT YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY VACANCY STATUS 14 14 7 11. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND VACANCY STATUS 171 171 195 318 16 2

12. SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED AND VACANT-FOR-SALE ONLY HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY STATUS BY CONDOMINIUM STATUS(11) 13 32596

13. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND OCCUPANCY STATUS BY PLUMBING FACILITIES 1617 1582 250 5

14. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED PAYING CASH RENT AND VACANT-FOR-RENT HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY STATUS 173 151

15. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH 1.01 OR MORE PERSONS PER UNIT BY TENURE, PERSONS, AND PLUMBING FACILITIES(13) 144 23 N/A N/A

16. PERSONS IN OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS LACKING COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE 144 23 N/A N/A

17. VACANT UNITS YEAR-ROUND WHICH ARE GUARDED UP FOR RENT, WHICH HAVE BEEN VACANT FOR 2 OR MORE MONTHS FOR SALE ONLY WHICH HAVE BEEN VACANT FOR 6 OR MORE MONTHS

NOTE: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES ARE FOOTNOTE REFERENCES. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE. B. BLANK CELLS INDICATE THAT THE NUMBER IS 0 OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

1. TOTAL PERSONS 454 2. HOUSING UNITS (INCLUDING SEASONAL AND MIGRATORY UNITS) BY URBAN AND RURAL (2) 1627 1627 1588 37

4. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY ROOMS 9 5 33 150 320 1100 5.6 7. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE 1588 259

1 ROOM 5 ROOMS 3 ROOMS 4 ROOMS 5 ROOMS 6 OR MORE ROOMS MEDIAN ROOMS 1 2 TO 9 10 OR MORE MOBILE HOME OR TRAILER

8. VACANT YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY VACANCY STATUS 14 14 7 11. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND VACANCY STATUS 171 171 195 318 16 2

12. SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED AND VACANT-FOR-SALE ONLY HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY STATUS BY CONDOMINIUM STATUS(11) 13 32596

13. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND OCCUPANCY STATUS BY PLUMBING FACILITIES 1617 1582 250 5

14. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED PAYING CASH RENT AND VACANT-FOR-RENT HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY STATUS 173 151

15. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH 1.01 OR MORE PERSONS PER UNIT BY TENURE, PERSONS, AND PLUMBING FACILITIES(13) 144 23 N/A N/A

16. PERSONS IN OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS LACKING COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE 144 23 N/A N/A

17. VACANT UNITS YEAR-ROUND WHICH ARE GUARDED UP FOR RENT, WHICH HAVE BEEN VACANT FOR 2 OR MORE MONTHS FOR SALE ONLY WHICH HAVE BEEN VACANT FOR 6 OR MORE MONTHS

NOTE: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES ARE FOOTNOTE REFERENCES. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE. B. BLANK CELLS INDICATE THAT THE NUMBER IS 0 OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

1. TOTAL PERSONS 454 2. HOUSING UNITS (INCLUDING SEASONAL AND MIGRATORY UNITS) BY URBAN AND RURAL (2) 1627 1627 1588 37

4. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY ROOMS 9 5 33 150 320 1100 5.6 7. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE 1588 259

1 ROOM 5 ROOMS 3 ROOMS 4 ROOMS 5 ROOMS 6 OR MORE ROOMS MEDIAN ROOMS 1 2 TO 9 10 OR MORE MOBILE HOME OR TRAILER

8. VACANT YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY VACANCY STATUS 14 14 7 11. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND VACANCY STATUS 171 171 195 318 16 2

12. SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED AND VACANT-FOR-SALE ONLY HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY STATUS BY CONDOMINIUM STATUS(11) 13 32596

13. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND OCCUPANCY STATUS BY PLUMBING FACILITIES 1617 1582 250 5

14. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED PAYING CASH RENT AND VACANT-FOR-RENT HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY STATUS 173 151

15. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH 1.01 OR MORE PERSONS PER UNIT BY TENURE, PERSONS, AND PLUMBING FACILITIES(13) 144 23 N/A N/A

16. PERSONS IN OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS LACKING COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE 144 23 N/A N/A

17. VACANT UNITS YEAR-ROUND WHICH ARE GUARDED UP FOR RENT, WHICH HAVE BEEN VACANT FOR 2 OR MORE MONTHS FOR SALE ONLY WHICH HAVE BEEN VACANT FOR 6 OR MORE MONTHS

NOTE: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES ARE FOOTNOTE REFERENCES. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE. B. BLANK CELLS INDICATE THAT THE NUMBER IS 0 OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.



# POVERTY PROFILE

PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER  
CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK

GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACES

TRACT: BG: ED: UAI CD:

1. FAMILIES BY FAMILY TYPE BY POVERTY STATUS IN 1979 BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF RELATED CHILDREN (3)

3. FAMILIES AND NONFAMILY HOUSEHOLDERS BY POVERTY STATUS IN 1979 BY AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER

6. PERSONS FOR WHOM POVERTY STATUS IS DETERMINED BY POVERTY STATUS IN 1979 BY AGE (4)

TOTAL:

INCOME ABOVE POVERTY LEVEL:

WITH RELATED CHILDREN:

UNDER 6 YEARS AND 6 TO 17

UNDER 6 YEARS ONLY

6 TO 17 YEARS ONLY

WITHOUT RELATED CHILDREN

INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:

WITH RELATED CHILDREN:

UNDER 6 YEARS AND 6 TO 17

UNDER 6 YEARS ONLY

6 TO 17 YEARS ONLY

WITHOUT RELATED CHILDREN

FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER, NO HUSBAND PRESENT:

INCOME ABOVE POVERTY LEVEL:

WITH RELATED CHILDREN:

UNDER 6 AND 6 TO 17

UNDER 6 YEARS ONLY

6 TO 17 YEARS ONLY

WITHOUT RELATED CHILDREN

INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:

UNDER 6 YEARS AND 6 TO 17

UNDER 6 YEARS ONLY

6 TO 17 YEARS ONLY

WITHOUT RELATED CHILDREN

2. FAMILIES WITH ONE OR MORE RELATED CHILDREN BY POVERTY STATUS IN 1979 BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF RELATED CHILDREN (3)

INCOME ABOVE POVERTY LEVEL:

WITH RELATED CHILDREN:

UNDER 5 YEARS AND 5 TO 17

UNDER 5 YEARS ONLY

5 TO 17 YEARS ONLY

INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:

WITH RELATED CHILDREN:

UNDER 5 YEARS AND 5 TO 17

UNDER 5 YEARS ONLY

5 TO 17 YEARS ONLY

FAMILIES NONFAMILY

HOUSEHOLDERS

INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:

15 TO 64 YEARS

65 YEARS AND OVER

INCOME BETWEEN 100 AND 124 PERCENT OF POVERTY LEVEL:

15 TO 64 YEARS

65 YEARS AND OVER

INCOME 125 PERCENT OF POVERTY LEVEL AND ABOVE:

15 TO 64 YEARS

65 YEARS AND OVER

4. UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS FOR WHOM POVERTY STATUS IS DETERMINED BY POVERTY STATUS IN 1979 BY AGE (4)

INCOME ABOVE POVERTY LEVEL:

RELATED CHILD

UNDER 5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

6 TO 17 YEARS

OTHER FAMILY MEMBER

INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:

RELATED CHILD

UNDER 5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

6 TO 17 YEARS

OTHER FAMILY MEMBER

INCOME ABOVE POVERTY LEVEL:

RELATED CHILD

UNDER 5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

6 TO 17 YEARS

OTHER FAMILY MEMBER

INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:

RELATED CHILD

UNDER 5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

6 TO 17 YEARS

OTHER FAMILY MEMBER

INCOME ABOVE POVERTY LEVEL:

RELATED CHILD

UNDER 5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

5 YEARS

RELATED CHILD

6 TO 17 YEARS

OTHER FAMILY MEMBER

NOTES: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESIS ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE  
R. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED



# EDUCATION PROFILE

## PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK  
GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: TKACT: RG: ED: UA: CO:  
1. PERSONS 3 YEARS OLD AND OVER ENROLLED IN SCHOOL BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT BY RACE  
AND SPANISH ORIGIN (5)  
6. PERSONS 25 YEARS OLD AND OVER BY RACE  
BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED (5)


## ANCESTRY AND LANGUAGE: RESIDENCE IN 1975; VETERAN STATUS; DISABILITY

PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER  
CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK

GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: TRACT: BG: ED: UA: CD:

1. PERSONS 5 YEARS AND OVER BY AGE  
BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME AND  
ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH (10)

5 TO 17 YEARS	18 YEARS AND OVER
951	3177
SPEAKS ONLY ENGLISH	
SPEAKS OTHER THAN ENGLISH:	
SPANISH SPOKEN:	
SPEAK ENGLISH VERY WELL OR WELL	5
SPEAK ENGLISH NOT WELL/NOT AT ALL	4
OTHER LANGUAGE SPOKEN:	
SPEAK ENGLISH VERY WELL OR WELL	7
SPEAK ENGLISH NOT WELL/NOT AT ALL	6

ENGLISH AND OTHER GROUP(S)  
FRENCH AND OTHER GROUP(S)  
GERMAN AND OTHER GROUP(S)  
IRISH AND OTHER GROUP(S)  
ITALIAN AND OTHER GROUP(S)  
POLISH AND OTHER GROUP(S)

757  
156  
1231  
1016  
178  
358

MALE FEMALE  
709 23  
924 1862

7. CIVILIANS 16 YEARS AND OVER BY SEX BY  
VETERAN STATUS8. CIVILIAN VETERANS 16 YEARS AND OVER BY  
PERIOD OF SERVICE (7)

MAY 1975 OR LATER ONLY 24  
VIETNAM ERA 141  
KOREAN CONFLICT 144  
WORLD WAR II 326  
WORLD WAR I 6  
OTHER (46) 91

4. PERSONS BY NATIVITY AND PLACE OF  
BIRTH (6)

NATIVE:  
BORN IN STATE OF RESIDENCE 3818  
BORN IN DIFFERENT STATE 690  
BORN ABROAD, AT SEA, ETC 8  
FOREIGN BORN 68

9. NONINSTITUTIONAL PERSONS 16 TO 64 YEARS  
BY WORK DISABILITY STATUS (1)

## 2. PERSONS BY ANCESTRY (14)

## SINGLE ANCESTRY GROUP:

DUTCH	12
ENGLISH	293
FRENCH	6
GERMAN	639
GREEK	21
HUNGARIAN	222
IRISH	134
ITALIAN	369
NORWEGIAN	18
POLISH	23
PORTUGUESE	101
RUSSIAN (49)	4
SCOTTISH	223
SWEDISH	2299
UKRAINIAN	56
OTHER (53)	164
MULTIPLE ANCESTRY GROUP	
ANCESTRY NOT SPECIFIED:	
OTHER (13)	
NOT REPORTED	

5. PERSONS 5 YEARS AND OVER BY  
RESIDENCE IN 1975

SAME HOUSE 3276  
DIFFERENT HOUSE:  
SAME COUNTY 832  
DIFFERENT COUNTY:  
SAME STATE 88  
DIFFERENT STATE:  
NORTHEAST 127  
NORTH CENTRAL 27  
SOUTH 18  
WEST  
ABROAD

6. PERSONS 5 YEARS AND OVER BY  
RESIDENCE IN 1975

IN SMSA IN 1980:  
SAME SMSA IN 1975:  
CENTRAL CITY 502  
REMAINDER OF SMSA 3606  
OUTSIDE THIS SMSA:  
DIFFERENT SMSA IN 1975 49  
NOT IN SMSA IN 1975 211  
NOT IN SMSA IN 1980:  
IN A SMSA IN 1975  
NOT IN A SMSA IN 1975

10. NONINSTITUTIONAL PERSONS 16 YEARS AND  
OVER BY AGE BY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION  
DISABILITY STATUS (1)

16 TO 64 YEARS AND OVER  
WITH A PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DISABILITY  
NO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DISABILITY  
2886 493

NOTES: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESIS ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE.  
R. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.  
C. LANGUAGE AND ANCESTRY CODES MAY BE OBTAINED UPON REQUEST.

# WORK AND TRAVEL TO WORK CHARACTERISTICS

PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER  
CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK

GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACES: TRACT:

RG: ED: UA: CD:

1. WORKERS 16 YEARS AND OVER BY PLACE OF WORK (STATE/COUNTY LEVEL)

37. WORKERS 16 YEARS AND OVER WHO DID NOT WORK AT HOME BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK (8)

10. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH VEHICLES AVAILABLE BY NUMBER OF VEHICLES (13)

WORKED IN STATE OF RESIDENCE:  
IN COUNTY OF RESIDENCE  
OUTSIDE COUNTY OF RESIDENCE  
WORKED OUTSIDE OF STATE  
NOT REPORTED (16)

LESS THAN 5 MINUTES

5 TO 9 MINUTES

10 TO 14 MINUTES

15 TO 19 MINUTES

20 TO 29 MINUTES

30 TO 44 MINUTES

45 TO 59 MINUTES

60 OR MORE MINUTES

MEAN TRAVEL TIME TO WORK

66  
408  
431  
312  
583  
118  
25  
15.2

753  
566  
140

2. WORKERS 16 YEARS AND OVER BY PLACE OF WORK (PLACE LEVEL) (17)

LIVING IN IDENTIFIED PLACE:

WORKED IN PLACE

WORKED OUTSIDE PLACE

NOT REPORTED (16)

NOT LIVING IN IDENTIFIED PLACE

634

1289

20

7. WORKERS 16 YEARS AND OVER WHO TRAVELED TO WORK BY CAR, TRUCK, OR VAN BY VEHICLE OCCUPANCY (45)

DRIVE ALONE

IN 2-PERSON CARPOOL

IN 3-PERSON CARPOOL

IN 4-PERSON CARPOOL

IN 5-OR-MORE PERSON CARPOOL

1097

258

59

12. PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER WITH UN-EMPLOYMENT IN 1979 BY WEEKS UNEMPLOYED

LIVING IN AN SMSA:

WORKED IN SAME SMSA:

CENTRAL CITY

REMAINDER

WORKED OUTSIDE OF SMSA

NOT REPORTED (16)

NOT LIVING IN AN SMSA

988

887

48

20

8. PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER BY SEX BY LABOR FORCE STATUS IN 1979

MALE

FEMALE

IN LABOR FORCE:

WORKED IN 1979:

WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

NO UNEMPLOYMENT

DID NOT WORK, WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

NOT IN LABOR FORCE

203

1065

222

762

634

1289

20

13. PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER WHO WORKED IN 1979 BY SEX BY USUAL HOURS WORKED PER WEEK IN 1979 BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979

MALE

FEMALE

25

876

358

72

68

98

9. PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER WITH UN-EMPLOYMENT 1979 BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN AND MEAN WEEKS UNEMPLOYED (5)

CAR, TRUCK, OR VAN:

DRIVE ALONE

CARPOOL

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (18)

WALKED ONLY

OTHER MEANS (19)

WORKED AT HOME

MALE

FEMALE

30

11

18

120

193

57

18

120

TOTAL

MEAN WEEKS UNEMPLOYED

WHITE

BLACK

AMER IND, ESKIMO, ALEUT

ASIAN & PACIFIC ISLDR

SPANISH ORIGIN

247

12.2

247

30

11

18

120

193

37.0

46.2

NOTES: 4. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESIS ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE.  
8. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

# PROFILE OF HOUSEHOLDS

PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER  
CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK  
GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: TRACT: BG: ED: UA: CD:

1. HOUSEHOLDS BY PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLDS (7) 5. FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF OWN CHILDREN BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER BY FAMILY TYPE (3,17,18) 6. NONFAMILY HOUSEHOLDS BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER (17,12)

TOTAL (3)	WITH OWN CHILDREN	WITHOUT OWN CHILDREN	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN	ESKIMO, ALEUT	ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER	SPANISH ORIGIN (ANY RACE)
1 PERSON	1608	564	539	304	304				
2 PERSONS	304								
3 PERSONS	509								
4 PERSONS	269								
5 PERSONS	273								
6 OR MORE PERSONS	125								
	128								

2. PERSONS BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE AND RELATIONSHIP

IN FAMILY HOUSEHOLD:

HOUSEHOLDER	1264
SPOUSE	1074
OTHER RELATIVES (20)	1735
NONRELATIVES (21)	12
IN NONFAMILY HOUSEHOLD:	
MALE HOUSEHOLDER	121
FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER	223
NONRELATIVES (21)	55
IN GROUP QUARTERS:	
INMATE OF INSTITUTION	100
OTHER	

3. PERSONS IN GROUP QUARTERS BY TYPE OF GROUP QUARTERS

MENTAL HOSPITAL	
HOME FOR THE AGED	
OTHER INSTITUTION	100
MILITARY BARRACKS	
COLLEGE DORMITORY	
OTHER GROUP QUARTERS	

4. MEAN NUMBER OF OWN CHILDREN BY FAMILY TYPE (3)

IN MARRIED-COUPLE FAMILY	1.9
IN FAMILY WITH MALE HOUSEHOLDER,	
NO WIFE PRESENT	.0
IN FAMILY WITH FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER,	
NO HUSBAND PRESENT	1.3

NOTES: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESIS ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE.  
R. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

## HOUSING UNIT STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

## PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER

## CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK

GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360

COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105

PLACE:

TRACTS:

BO: ED: UA: CU:

## 1. HOUSING UNITS (INCLUDING VACANT SEASONAL AND MIGRATORY UNITS) (23)

TOTAL	1627
INSIDE URBANIZED AREAS	1627
OTHER URRAN	
RURAL	
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE COUNT	266
100-PERCENT COUNT (25)	1627

## 2. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY STATUS

TOTAL	1627
OCCUPIED (16)	1588
VACANT	39

## 3. VACANT HOUSING UNITS BY VACANCY STATUS

FOR SALE ONLY	10
FOR RENT	14
HELD FOR OCCASIONAL USE	3
OTHER VACANTS (26)	12

## 4. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE

TOTAL	1588
RENTER OCCUPIED	259

## 5. PERSONS IN OCCUPIED UNITS BY TENURE (19)

TOTAL	4544
RENTER OCCUPIED	696

## 6. MEAN NUMBER OF ROOMS IN YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS (19)

6.1

## 7. HOUSING UNITS (INCLUDING VACANT SEASONAL AND MIGRATORY) BY TENURE AND OCCUPANCY STATUS BY UNITS IN STRUCTURE

TOTAL:	965
1, DETACHED	487
1, ATTACHED	63
2	29
3 AND 4	29
5 OR MORE	54
MOBILE HOME OR TRAILER (24)	
TOTAL OCCUPIED:	962
1, DETACHED	469
1, ATTACHED	55
2	21
3 AND 4	27
5 OR MORE	54
MOBILE HOME OR TRAILER	

## 12. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND OCCUPANCY STATUS BY YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT

TOTAL:	7
1979 TO MARCH 1980	13
1975 TO 1978	82
1970 TO 1974	230
1960 TO 1969	318
1950 TO 1959	205
1940 TO 1949	772
1939 OR EARLIER	
TOTAL OCCUPIED:	7
1979 TO MARCH 1980	13
1975 TO 1978	82
1970 TO 1974	230
1960 TO 1969	318
1950 TO 1959	199
1940 TO 1949	739
1939 OR EARLIER	

## 8. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY STORIES IN STRUCTURE

1 TO 3	1617
4 TO 6	10
7 TO 12	
13 OR MORE	10

## 9. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS IN STRUCTURE WITH 4 OR MORE STORIES BY PASSENGER ELEVATOR

WITH ELEVATOR	10
NO ELEVATOR	

TOTAL	1588
RENTER OCCUPIED	259

WHITE

BLACK

1588

259

## 10. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER (17)

AMER IND	ASIAN AND	ESKIMO	PACIFIC	ISLANDER	OTHER	SPANISH ORIGIN
----------	-----------	--------	---------	----------	-------	----------------

## HOUSING UNIT UTILITY CHARACTERISTICS

PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER  
CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK

GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: TRACT:

HG: ED: UA: CU:

1. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE BY YEAR  
HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT

	TOTAL	RENTER	5. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY HEATING EQUIPMENT	9. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TELEPHONE IN HOUSING UNIT
1979 TO MARCH 1980	147	84	STEAM OR HOT WATER	115
1975 TO 1978	265	102	CENTRAL WARM AIR	1483
1970 TO 1974	216	21	ELECTRIC HEAT PUMP	WITH TELEPHONE
1960 TO 1969	432	35	OTHER BUILT-IN ELECTRIC	NO TELEPHONE
1950 TO 1959	316	17	FLOOR, WALL, PIPELESS	1572
1949 OR EARLIER	212	17	FURNACE	16
			ROOM HEATERS WITH FLUE	
			ROOM HEATERS NO FLUE	21
			FIREPLACES, STOVE, OR	8
			PORTABLE ROOM HEATERS	
			NONE	

2. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND  
OCCUPANCY STATUS BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS

	TOTAL	TOTAL OCCUPIED	RENTER OCCUPIED	6. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY HOUSE HEATING FUEL	10. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLDERS OF SELECTED AGE GROUPS BY AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER BY TELEPHONE IN HOUSING UNIT
NONE	2	29	23	UTILITY GAS (27)	60 TO 64 YEARS
1	32	333	91	BOTTLED, TANK, LP GAS	65 YEARS
2	343	778	77	ELECTRICITY	AND OVER
3	802	402	68	FUEL OIL, KEROSENE, ETC	
4	402	46		COAL OR COKE	
5 OR MORE	46			WOOD	
				OTHER FUEL	
				NO FUEL USED	

3. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND  
OCCUPANCY STATUS BY NUMBER OF BATHROOMS

	TOTAL	TOTAL OCCUPIED	RENTER OCCUPIED	7. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY COOKING FUEL	11. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY AIR CONDITIONING
NO BATHROOM OR ONLY	2	997	236	UTILITY GAS (27)	NONE
A HALF BATH	1030	384	23	BOTTLED, TANK, LP GAS	CENTRAL SYSTEM
1 COMPLETE BATHROOM	388	207		ELECTRICITY	1 INDIVIDUAL ROOM UNIT
1 COMPLETE BATHROOM PLUS HALF BATH(S)	207			OTHER (27)	2 OR MORE INDIVIDUAL ROOM UNITS
2 OR MORE COMPLETE BATHROOMS				NO FUEL USED	46
				8. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY WATER HEATING FUEL	
				UTILITY GAS (27)	12. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY SEWAGE DISPOSAL
				BOTTLED, TANK, LP GAS	PUBLIC SEWER
				ELECTRICITY	SEPTIC TANK OR CESSPOOL
				OTHER (27)	OTHER MEANS
				NO FUEL USED	1627

4. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY KITCHEN  
FACILITIES

	TOTAL	TOTAL OCCUPIED	RENTER OCCUPIED	13. YEAR-ROUND HOUSING UNITS BY SOURCE OF WATER	PUBLIC SYSTEM OR PRIVATE CO
COMPLETE KITCHEN FACILITIES	1608	19		UTILITY GAS (27)	INDIVIDUAL WELL:
NO COMPLETE KITCHEN FACILITIES	19			BOTTLED, TANK, LP GAS	DRILLED
				ELECTRICITY	DUG
				FUEL OIL, KEROSENE, ETC	SOME OTHER SOURCE
				OTHER (27)	
				NO FUEL USED	

NOTES: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESIS ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE.  
H. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

## HOUSING UNIT QUALITY INDICATORS PROFILE

PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER  
CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY TAPE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK  
GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: TRACT: RG: ED: UA: CD:

1. SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED NONCONDOMINIUM HOUSING UNITS BY MORTGAGE STATUS AND YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT AND MEAN SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS (30,35)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
WITH A MORTGAGE:		
1975 TO MARCH 1980	166	\$ 341
1970 TO 1974	131	\$ 343
1960 TO 1969	187	\$ 265
1959 OR EARLIER	33	\$ 283
NOT MORTGAGED	654	\$ 142

2. MEAN VALUE OF SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED NONCONDOMINIUM HOUSING UNITS (19,30,31)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
WITH A MORTGAGE:		
1975 TO MARCH 1980	166	\$ 341
1970 TO 1974	131	\$ 343
1960 TO 1969	187	\$ 265
1959 OR EARLIER	33	\$ 283
NOT MORTGAGED	654	\$ 142

3. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE BY HEATING EQUIPMENT BY YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT BY PERSONS PER ROOM (35,29)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
WITH CENTRAL HEATING SYSTEM:		
1939 OR EARLIER:		
LESS THAN 1.01 PERSONS	721	
1.01 OR MORE PERSONS	1A	
1940 TO MARCH 1980:		
LESS THAN 1.01 PERSON	823	
1.01 OR MORE PERSONS	1A	
LACKING CENTRAL HEATING SYSTEM:		
1939 OR EARLIER:		
LESS THAN 1.01 PERSONS	0	
1.01 OR MORE PERSONS	0	
1940 TO MARCH 1980:		
LESS THAN 1.01 PERSONS	A	
1.01 OR MORE PERSONS	0	

4. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER (17,29)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
WHITE	1588	
BLACK	1588	
AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO, ALEUT	0	
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER (6)	0	
SPANISH ORIGIN (ANY RACE)	0	

5. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE AND STRUCTURE BUILT 1939 OR EARLIER BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER (17,29)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
WHITE	739	
BLACK	739	
AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO, ALEUT	0	
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER (6)	0	
SPANISH ORIGIN (ANY RACE)	0	

6. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE AND WITH 1.01 PERSONS PER ROOM OR MORE BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER (17,29)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
WHITE	36	
BLACK	36	
AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO, ALEUT	0	
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER (6)	0	
SPANISH ORIGIN (ANY RACE)	0	

7. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH COMPLETE PLUMBING FACILITIES FOR EXCLUSIVE USE AND LACKING CENTRAL HEATING EQUIPMENT BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER (17,29,33)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
WHITE	8	
BLACK	8	
AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO, ALEUT	0	
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER	0	
SPANISH ORIGIN (ANY RACE)	0	

8. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY INCLUSION OF UTILITIES IN RENT (28,32)

	TOTAL	MEAN SELECTED COSTS
PAY EXTRA FOR 1 OR MORE UTILITIES	219	
NO EXTRA PAYMENT FOR ANY UTILITIES	40	

NOTES: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE.  
B. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE DATA CENTER  
CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING, 1980--SUMMARY 1APE FILE 3A

LAWRENCE PARK  
GEOGRAPHY: STATE: 42 SMSA: 2360 COUNTY: 049 MCD: 105 PLACE: TRACT: HG: ED: UA: CD:

1. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY GROSS RENT (28)  
4. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER BY GROSS RENT (17,28)

LESS THAN \$60	LESS THAN \$100 TO \$100	\$200 TO \$299	\$300 OR MORE	NO CASH RENT
\$60 TO \$79	0	0	0	0
\$80 TO \$99	0	0	0	0
\$100 TO \$119	0	77	110	46
\$120 TO \$149	0	0	0	0
\$150 TO \$169	23	0	0	0
\$170 TO \$199	54	0	0	0
\$200 TO \$249	44	0	0	0
\$250 TO \$299	66	0	0	0
\$300 TO \$349	42	0	0	0
\$350 TO \$399	4	0	0	0
\$400 TO \$499	0	0	0	0
\$500 OR MORE	0	0	0	0
MEDIAN	\$ 245			
MEAN	\$ 245			
NO CASH RENT	26			

5. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1979 BY GROSS RENT AS PERCENTAGE OF INCOME (28)

LESS THAN \$5000	\$5000 TO \$9999	\$10000 TO \$14999	\$15000 TO \$19999	\$20000 OR MORE
LESS THAN 20 PERCENT	0	0	7	26
20 TO 24 PERCENT	0	8	26	23
25 TO 34 PERCENT	0	0	25	0
35 PERCENT OR MORE	9	43	0	0
NOT COMPUTED (34)	0	8	0	18

2. SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS PAYING CASH RENT AND VACANT-FOR-RENT UNITS BY MEAN CONTRACT RENT (19,28)

RENTER OCCUPIED	233
MEAN CONTRACT RENT	\$ 172
VACANT FOR RENT	14
MEAN RENT ASKED	\$ 167

3. SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED NON-CONDOMINIUM HOUSING UNITS BY MORTGAGE STATUS AND SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS

WITH A MORTGAGE:	NOT MORTGAGED:
LESS THAN \$100	7
\$100 TO \$149	23
\$150 TO \$199	15
\$200 TO \$249	106
\$250 TO \$299	97
\$300 TO \$349	141
\$350 TO \$399	46
\$400 TO \$449	24
\$450 TO \$499	28
\$500 TO \$599	19
\$600 TO \$749	11
\$750 OR MORE	0
MEDIAN	\$ 304

7. SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED NONCONDOMINIUM HOUSING UNITS BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER BY MORTGAGE STATUS AND SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS (17,30,36)

LESS THAN \$200	\$200 TO \$299	\$300 TO \$399	\$400 TO \$499	\$500 OR MORE
WHITE	45	203	187	52
BLACK	0	0	0	0
AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO, ALEUT	0	0	0	0
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER	0	0	0	0
SPANISH ORIGIN	0	0	0	0

NOTES: A. NUMBERS IN PARENTHESIS ARE FOOTNOTE NUMBERS. SEE FOOTNOTE PAGE.  
R. BLANK CELLS INDICATE EITHER THAT THE NUMBER IS "0" OR THE DATA ARE SUPPRESSED.

LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP OPINION SURVEY  
1983

Dear Lawrence Park Resident:

The Planning Commission of Lawrence Park Township is in the midst of reviewing, updating, improving and revising short and long range plans, zoning and subdivision ordinances and other concerns necessary to assure that our Township will remain a "good place to live". With that in mind, we ask you, a resident and one who is familiar with your neighborhood and its characteristics, for your thoughts and opinions on the items included on the following pages.


A similar survey was conducted 11 years ago by the East Lake Jaycees in cooperation with Lawrence Park Township. Several items, which were concerns of yours at that time, have now been corrected or improved - thanks to your guidance. It is the hope of the Planning Commission that similar items will be called to our attention as a result of this survey and that our planning efforts will benefit from your suggestions.

This survey was delivered to you by a Lawrence Park resident. She will return to your house on \_\_\_\_\_ to pick up your completed survey. This method will assure us of a high return factor. If you will not be home this day, please put the survey form in your door or drop it off at the Township Office at 864 Silliman Avenue.

If you have any questions concerning the survey, please call Jim Weigle at 899-8552 or Jack Shabel at 899-1640.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Janis Mahoney, Chairman  
Lawrence Park Township  
Planning Commission

LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP OPINION SURVEY

1983

TOTAL

Part A

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ON THE FOLLOWING FACILITIES AND SERVICES?

		Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	No Comment
1.	Street conditions are	55	323	223	49	19
2.	Police protection is	208	311	110	23	17
3.	Fire protection is	412	222	14	1	20
4.	Ambulance service is	433	193	14	1	28
5.	Justice of the Peace services are	77	294	128	54	116
6.	Erie City Bus service is	80	351	145	23	70
7.	In your area, playgrounds are	53	306	113	56	141
8.	The Napier Avenue Park is	50	264	87	19	249
9.	The Morse Street Park is	36	237	116	23	257
10.	The Lake Cliff Park is	29	251	135	36	218
11.	The Twp. boat ramp at L. Cliff is	22	152	144	74	277
12.	Supervision of playgrounds in summer is	59	238	115	32	225
13.	The pressure of city water is	96	391	109	52	21
14.	Garbage and refuse collection is	347	274	34	5	9
15.	Sewers in your area are	124	405	91	25	24
16.	Parking in the Business District is	35	274	216	96	48
17.	Traffic movement in the Twp. is	56	407	137	26	43
18.	The general appearance of your area is	127	383	108	36	15
19.	The general appearance of L.P. is	54	413	151	27	24
20.	Traffic signals & signs in L.P. are	46	408	155	29	31
21.	Snow removal is	195	309	114	33	18
22.	Street lighting is	116	383	133	22	15
23.	Maintenance of streets is	88	340	175	40	26
24.	Zoning ordinances in the Twp. are	39	285	160	32	153
25.	Enforcement of zoning ordinances is	30	252	150	50	187
26.	Local news coverage by newspaper is	20	205	241	146	57
27.	Local news coverage by radio is	17	186	243	138	90
28.	Local news coverage by T.V. is	24	184	240	131	90
29.	L.P. Elementary School: staff is	68	217	104	14	266
30.	Building and equipment is	74	265	77	13	240
31.	Quality of Educational Program is	79	224	112	22	232
32.	Discipline in the school is	37	185	155	41	251
33.	Iroquois High School: staff is	56	226	120	18	249
34.	Building and equipment is	86	279	77	5	222
35.	Quality of Educational Program is	65	217	126	26	235
36.	Discipline in the school is	39	151	155	59	265
37.	Communication between school & community is	51	225	161	62	170

LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP OPINION SURVEY

1983

TOTAL

Part B

WHAT ARE YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE FOLLOWING:

		Yes	No	No Comment
1.	Did you attend the Erie Playhouse within the last year?	160	499	10
2.	Is there noticeable air pollution in your area?	237	399	33
3.	Do you favor the elimination of outside trash burning?	292	362	15
4.	Do you approve of offshore drilling in Lake Erie?	188	416	65
5.	Are there disturbing noises in your area?	246	394	29
6.	Should Nagle Road, between Iroquois Avenue & Buffalo Road be reopened?	548	80	41
7.	Should there be more traffic control at Harborcreek Mall?	384	241	44
8.	Should the intersection at East Lake Road & Iroquois Ave. be redesigned to allow a safer traffic pattern?	476	153	40
9.	Do you use the Tri-Community swimming pool?	141	517	11
10.	Is Lawrence Park a good place to live?	635	12	22
11.	Are you satisfied with the political make up of the Twp.?	504	95	70
12.	Should senior citizen housing be constructed in L.P.?	471	119	79
13.	Should "Sex Education" be included in the curriculum from grades K thru 12?	438	135	96
14.	Are the L.P. schools, in conjunction with the Lions Club & L.P. Fire Dept. giving adequate attention to safety education	510	34	125
15.	Should the School Board communicate more than 3 times per year with the residents and "Information Bulletin"?	283	297	89
16.	Should Iroquois have a year-round school program with students required to attend a minimum of 9 months?	238	311	120
17.	Should there be a community building which would have community meeting rooms and house the Township offices?	275	305	89
18.	For safety and traffic control, should the light at Main & Rankine be moved to Main and Smithson?	182	373	114
19.	Should the School Board continue to mail the "Information Bulletin" to all residents?	581	40	48
20.	Should a plan be developed to beautify Main Street?	507	106	56
21.	Should a county wide reassessment occur in the near future?	294	271	104

LAWRENCE PARK TOWNSHIP OPINION SURVEY  
1983

TOTAL  
Part C

1. Please check (✓) the area in which you live:

138	South of Main Street between Water Street and Iroquois Avenue.		
91	Between Main Street and Iroquois Avenue.		
238	Between Iroquois Avenue and the lake.		
185	Lake Cliff area.	17	No Comment

2. How old is the building you live in?

1	Less than 3 years	78	11 - 20 years		
5	3 - 5 years	307	21 - 50 years		
21	6 - 10 years	244	over 50 years	13	No Comment

3. What is the age of the head of your household?

14	18 - 24 years	106	45 - 54 years		
88	25 - 34 years	168	55 - 64 years		
102	35 - 44 years	187	65 and over	4	No Comment

Part D

PERSONAL PROFILE

	Yes	No	No Comment
1. Have you lived in Lawrence Park five or more years?	594	72	3
2. Do you own your home (including buying)?	606	62	1
3. Are there school age children in your family?	231	432	6
4. Would you be interested in living in senior citizen housing in Lawrence Park Township?	246	366	57
5. Are you or any member of your family currently receiving unemployment compensation or have you already exhausted benefits?	68	590	11

PART E

OPEN END QUESTIONS

- WHAT RETAIL BUSINESSES WOULD YOU SUPPORT IN LAWRENCE PARK? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- PLEASE IDENTIFY ANY EXISTING OR POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS TRAFFIC/ PEDESTRIAN SITUATIONS IN THE TOWNSHIP: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- IN YOUR OPINION WHAT ARE SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS WHICH NEED TO BE DONE TO MAKE THIS A BETTER COMMUNITY?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL

PART E

TOP ANSWERS:

Question #1

Hardware Store	117
Grocery Store	66
5 & 10 Store	48
Variety Store	34
Drug Store	30
Bakery	25
Department Store	24
Cleaners	23
Shoe Store	19
None	18
Fast Food Restaurant	10
General Store	9

Question #2

Iroquois/E. Lake Road	88
Nagle/E. Lake Road	38
Visibility - Main/Smithson	24
Speeding Iroquois, Nagle, etc.	21
Harborcreek Mall Entrance	15
Iroquois/Nagle Road	11
G. E. Traffic	7

Question #3

Improve Main Street	85
Repair Sidewalks	43
Control Dogs/Cats	42
Clean up yards, trash, etc.	33
Open Nagle crossing	18
Repair Streets	15
Upgrade Academics	14
Better Street Lighting	6

